HISTORY, AUTHORITY AND THEOLOGY

A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D.

1.45

HISTORY, AUTHORITY AND THEOLOGY

HISTORY, AUTHORITY AND THEOLOGY

By

THE REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON
FORMERLY FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET W.
1909

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD.,
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.

CONJUGI CARISSIMAE

2024371

PREFACE

THE essays in the following pages were written at various dates during the last twenty years. They represent the results of investigations undertaken to satisfy my own mind on the many questions raised at the present day as to the truth and the form of the Christian Religion. They are fragments of larger works which I had projected and had hoped to carry out, if the continuous strain of the practical occupations in which I have been involved had permitted. They have all been useful to myself, and I hope may be of some use to others. For this reason I have thought it better not to allow the developement of the argument or investigation to be obscured through fear of an occasional overlapping of one essay with another.

I have only to express my obligation to Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., for allowing me to republish the second essay; to the Proprietors of *The Church Quarterly Review* for a similar permission as regards the third and fourth; to the Eastern Church Association as to the sixth, and Messrs. Longmans, Green, & Co.

as regards the seventh. The fifth and eighth were originally published by Mr. John Murray, to whom I am indebted for undertaking the production of this volume. I must also thank the Rev. Claude Jenkins for assistance in reading the proofs and the construction of the Index.

A. C. H.

September, 1909.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTORY	1
II.	THE SOURCES AND AUTHORITY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.	42
III.	THE NEW THEOLOGY	79
IV.	THE ATHANASIAN CREED	110
V.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES	146
VI.	THE TEACHING OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH	192
VII.	METHODS OF EARLY CHURCH HISTORY .	229
VIII.	THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS	278
	INDEX	321

History, Authority and Theology

I

INTRODUCTORY[1]

IT has become a trite observation that there is need for a re-statement of the content of Christian doctrine and the arguments used in its defence. That that should be the case will excite no surprise among those who have any acquaintance with the history of Christian thought. No two phenomena are more striking in the developement of the human mind than the two complementary facts of the unchangeableness of the Christian creed and the constant mutability of its presentation: just as at the present time the immense variety of Christian thought and language, the far too numerous divisions of Christianity, have to be balanced by the oneness of the Gospel message.

The recognition of these two complementary facts is essential at the present day. A treatise on religious life can be translated readily from the language of one age to the language of another. The catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem might provide a very adequate manual for a series of Confirmation addresses;

[1] The greater part of this essay was read at a meeting of Associates of King's College in the Southwark Diocese held in the Bishop of Southwark's house.

but to copy his methods of Old Testament exegesis would be unfortunate. While there is this oneness in doctrine, the variation in theology, in the philosophic form of presentment, still more in apologetic statement, is very great. There is little difference between Christianity as conceived by Justin Martyr in the second century and Christianity as we conceive it; but the arguments by which he proves the truth of his religion in controversy with a Jew would carry little weight at the present day. It is difficult to imagine mental atmospheres more different from this age than those of Origen or Tertullian or Augustine. The change created by the introduction of the scholastic philosophy was as stupendous as that introduced by Luther or the revolution created by the growth of Modernism. To many pious minds changes such as these when they take place, and the rise of novelty in theology, present a terrible stumbling-block; but a knowledge of history will exercise a most assuring influence here as elsewhere, and it suggests that, so far from new teaching being harmful, there would be something unsound if there were not this continuous progress in the presentation of Christian truth.

Although our minds need not then be disturbed by the developement of new methods in the statement of Christian theology, it will always demand the most careful thought and the devotion of many minds to bring the message home to each generation. It will demand faithfulness to tradition and sympathy with the age in which we live. We have to be good money-changers, distinguishing the false from the true. We have to be scribes of the Kingdom of Heaven, bringing forth treasures new and old. We must be careful guardians of the treasure that is committed to us, but we must not confuse it with the earthen vessel in which it is contained.

The chief point of unity in the following pages, which contain essays written during the last twenty years, is that they are all concerned with the double purpose of the defence and re-statement of Christianity. They are fragments of an attempt deliberately made to discover, primarily for the writer's own satisfaction, whether, in any real sense of the word, what we know as Christianity is true; what Christianity is; what is the authority on which we receive it; how far we can trust that authority; how far we shall find it necessary to criticize, to re-state, or to modify its teaching. The essays are unfortunately fragmentary in their character, and often very incomplete, but they have the unity of a consistent purpose, and it may be a help to some readers if an attempt is made to sum up the various questions and difficulties of the present day which are discussed in them. To some the attitude taken may seem familiar and commonplace, to some it may be unattractive; but there are many, it is believed, to whom a statement of the writer's own point of view may be useful.

I

The relation of our religious belief to modern criticism is a subject which causes, or at any rate has caused, considerable perplexity, particularly to those who have been brought up in a different order of things. As the Archbishop of Canterbury said in a recent Charge, there is a feeling of bewilderment. People want to know where the process of destructive criticism will stop. They seem to feel the ground sliding under their feet. They reconcile themselves to some new attitude with regard to the Bible, and before they have established themselves there another change takes place;

the earth under them seems to slide, and again they are uncertain as to their foothold. The problem is somewhat different in relation to the Old and the New Testament. We will begin with the former.

Let us try and put the difficulty as it has appeared to older people. A man has been brought up in the belief that the Old Testament as a whole, and probably in most of its details, represents a true historical record; that it is a Divine work; that it is the revelation of God speaking to man, and that we must mould our lives according to its rules and can prove our beliefs out of its pages. He finds the historical existence of Adam, of Abraham, of Moses, assumed in the New Testament; and he believes that the truth of his religion is involved in the acceptance of these historical facts. Perhaps he has assimilated in some form the lessons of geology, and does not think that the world was created in six ordinary days. He may be a little doubtful as to whether Adam really lived, but beyond that he has no difficulties. He is bewildered when he is told that the historical existence of the patriarchs is doubtful, still more when the same is said of Moses. He may have reconciled himself to two Isaiahs, but Professor Cheyne's work, with its minute analysis and multiplicity of writers, begins to make him incredulous. The wholesale removal of the Pentateuch to the post-exilic period is bewildering. He begins to doubt about criticism; and then he comes across some of Professor Cheyne's later speculations, and he says at once: This at any rate is nonsense; if this is what criticism leads to, the less we have to do with it the better. Then he reads, without having any opportunity of testing or controlling them, some of Professor Sayce's writings on archaeology, and he jumps to the conclusion that all criticism is futile. He is inclined to turn a deaf ear to modern thought and

fall back on the old traditional attitude. Then, perhaps, he comes across a sharp critic, who sees the weak point in his position and drives in his dart. "Here is your religion, built upon a basis of disputed historical fact. Cheyne, or Sayce, or Driver, or Wellhausen may be right. But is it not all a matter of opinion? What do we really know? The controversy as to the early history of Israel is very interesting, like that about Homer or the early history of the Greeks. No doubt archaeology has done a great deal to overthrow the jejune historical views of early nineteenth-century critics. We know that the ancient world was much more wonderful than we used to think it; but, all the same, this does not really prove anything that you want. It does not prove the reality of a single Old Testament miracle. It does not reconcile the discrepancies between different parts of the Old Testament. It does not alter the crude character of the conception of the Divine. It does nothing really to build up your religion. The facts are doubtful, and for my part I cannot rest my faith on such a very unsubstantial basis." Now, *prima facie*, this criticism appears to carry a good deal of weight, and it suggests the necessity of finding a more substantial foundation, independent of these variations of opinion. Can we get a position with regard to the Old Testament which shall be independent of the fleeting and changing opinions of historical criticism?

In an investigation such as this, we should attempt if possible to begin with what is certain, and, starting from that basis, advance further to what may be less certain. If we turn to the beginnings of the Christian era, if we turn to the time of our Lord, we shall find that there is a good deal about the Old Testament which we know for certain, which is not dependent upon doubtful speculations or unconvincing literary arguments,

but is established historical fact. We know what Judaism was at the time when our Lord came into the world. We know its beliefs and hopes and aspirations. We know, too, apart from one or two doubtful points, the contents of its Canon of Scripture. We know that the books of which this Scripture consisted had already existed for some considerable time in the form in which they then were, and that they had been translated at least a hundred years before, if not longer, into other languages. These books correspond substantially to our present Old Testament. If we examine them, we shall find that they present a double aspect. On the one side they are a collection of books of various characters, some historical, some legal, some prophetic or poetical or devotional, belonging obviously to different periods of history. They are the historical memorials of a great people. In the second place, they contain in their present form the impression of a definite religious belief. There may be signs that these documents, like other ancient writings, have only gradually attained their present form. There may be signs that the creed that now distinguishes them was not always held in its final form. There may be survivals or traces of the survival of ancient beliefs. But that there was a Jewish religion, witnessed to by the Old Testament, and taught at the time of our Lord, there can be no doubt. Let us analyze that creed.

It was based upon the sublime idea of Monotheism. That conception permeates the whole of the Old Testament as we have it; and this is true, although it is also true that there are signs that there had been a developement in that belief, and that a period had existed when the conception was held in a very incomplete form. In technical language, the Jewish people had advanced from henotheism, or monolatry,

as it is sometimes called, to Monotheism: that is to say, they had originally believed that Jehovah was the God of Israel, a God more powerful than those of the surrounding nations; they had only gradually learnt the conception that the Lord is the God of all the earth. We find that this conception is taught in lofty and dignified language; and when we compare the Hebrew belief in God with any other survival from the ancient world, we find it different, not only in sublimity but in character, from anything that had existed elsewhere. We find, indeed, occasionally a pantheistic belief in the spiritual which is sometimes described in language which seems personal. We find that the writings of the higher minds of the ancient world, when interpreted through Christian preconceptions, attain almost the language of theism. Some sort of conception of one absolute Principle seems to have been the attainment of Platonism; but nowhere do we find the belief in one living personal God. And this conception is attained amongst the Jews, not by an elaborate process of rational or metaphysical argument, but through the revelation of spiritual religion. The prophets never prove that there is a God; they reveal a God.

Then, secondly, this God is above all a righteous God. There may be limitations in the Old Testament idea of righteousness judged by the more advanced standard of Christianity; but throughout Jehovah is represented as a God exalted in righteousness. If we compare the conception of the Deity with that of the surrounding Semitic nations, if we realize the difficulty which gradually presented itself to the more philosophical minds among the Greeks when they began to reflect upon the moral standard of the Homeric gods, the contrast becomes apparent. The

Greek, if he were moral, was moral in spite of his religion; the Jew was moral *because* of his religion. He was taught by a long succession of prophets claiming to reveal the will of God, and putting prominently before the nation the ideals of pure worship, of justice, of mercy, of truth, as the lofty conception of human life which their religion ordained.

Thirdly, as the God of Israel was a righteous God, so the Old Testament taught a rule of life for Israel, the people of Jehovah. The law of Israel had of course its limitations: it was slowly developed; it was imperfect; it was negative; it was, as we know, a legal system intended to prepare the way for something higher. As exhibited by the current Judaism of the time of our Lord, it confused the moral and the ceremonial; that ceremonial had been developed in certain circles in an exaggerated form, in a manner added to rather than derived from the Old Testament. But granting every limitation, the Jew was conspicuous amid the break-up of custom and use and old-world morality that distinguished the Roman Empire by the fact that he had still a code of life and of morals which he observed. And the reason that he did so was this: unlike other nations, his moral principles were dependent, not on civic or ethnic custom, which might be obliterated by change of political circumstances, but on the will of God—on the will of a God who was Himself the embodiment of righteousness and the God of the whole earth. Hence the law of the Jew was one that he must obey; his morality was one that he must conform to, in Rome or in Alexandria as much as in Jerusalem. We need not dwell longer on the limitations of that morality; the New Testament makes them clear, and shews us the proper point of view from which we must regard them. The significant

point is the existence of this moral system and the strength of the sanction by which it was supported.

Then, fourthly, we find in the history of Israel a conviction—a conviction which was prominent at the time of our Lord—that Israel was the chosen people selected for a particular purpose. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Whenever these words were spoken—and there is no need for our purpose to assume that they were spoken to Abraham—they represent the conviction of the history of Israel. Israel was the people that God loved, the depositary of a higher religious teaching. They had a knowledge which other nations had not. From Jerusalem a light was to go forth to the Gentiles; the word of the Lord should proceed through the whole earth. This conception, like other conceptions, had its period of growth. The religion of Israel did not spring into the world full-grown; it was often held very imperfectly; there was a narrowness about Judaism side by side with its universal hope. Not all its religious teachers rise to the height represented by the Book of Isaiah; but the Old Testament as a whole clearly tells us of the world-mission of the people of Israel, of their true relation to God, and of their position in the world as His servant.

And then, lastly, this consciousness of their mission is connected with the Messianic expectation. No doubt the force and significance of this expectation has suffered in many minds because the early Christian writers, and many of those who have copied them, have supported it by using passages in a sense which later exegesis cannot support. Many passages quoted in the New Testament, and still more of those quoted in the early Church, in favour of the Messianic belief, are clearly entirely divorced from their original

meaning. That that should have been so was, however, in no way unnatural. The writers were simply reflecting the ordinary exegetical methods and the ordinary intellectual conceptions of their times. People's minds were full of the idea of the Messiah. They accepted the Old Testament as inspired, without any sense of historical developement or criticism. Any passage, therefore, which seemed to have a bearing upon Messianic belief was naturally pressed into service. But it must be clearly remembered that the Messianic belief caused these misinterpretations; they did not create the belief. Whenever there exists an allegorical or non-natural method of interpretation of Scripture, it must be remembered that some pre-existent belief has caused people to find their own ideas in particular passages. The question therefore arises, what was the origin of the Messianic belief? Some doubtful and misinterpreted passages have gradually been discarded from ordinary religious instruction. Others still live on, and continue to foster the idea that the reality of the Messianic belief depends upon the misapplication of texts. But discard all such passages and ask: Did the Jews before our Lord's time expect a Messiah? and the answer must be, Yes. Did they build up this belief on the basis of the Old Testament? and the answer must be, Yes. Was it a correct interpretation of the hopes and aspirations of the Old Testament? and the answer must be, Yes. Was that conception as contained in the Old Testament higher and more spiritual than the conceptions of the Jews at the time of our Lord? and the answer must be, Yes. Was the life and teaching of our Lord a real fulfilment of the Divine purpose with which the Old Testament was instinct? again the answer must be, Yes. The expectation of the Old Testament, which had already inspired the

Jewish people with its reality, and had sustained among them, in spite of many temporary misfortunes, their religious hopes and aspirations, is fulfilled in our Lord and in the Christian Church which He founded in a manner far more wonderful than had been realized or expected.

Now here we have shortly the creed and the hope of Judaism. This is what the Old Testament teaching gives as a preparation for Christianity. This is the expectation which is fulfilled in Christianity, and this expectation and fulfilment combined give a tremendous support to the Christian claims. The argument is independent of the historical truth of particular facts. It leaves us free to apply any rational criticism to the Old Testament. It is equally valid even if we were to accept the most advanced and bizarre views of Professor Cheyne. The creed of the Jewish people is independent of the question whether the writers have confused Musri and Mizraim, and ignored the historical character of the fortunes of Jerahmeel. In the Old Testament as a body of books existing substantially in the form in which we have them considerably before the Christian era, and as interpreted and fulfilled in Christianity, in the long period of preparation leading to the coming of Christ, of which they give us a record, we have a series of profound spiritual facts which demand an explanation; and no purely rationalistic theory has provided or can provide an adequate cause for this phenomenon. Here we have, independent of any particular critical opinions, certain facts which witness profoundly to the reality of religious life and teaching.

The particular view which we may take of the Bible as a historical document does not affect the above argument. But as a historical document the Bible

remains of supreme interest. It gives us an account of the history, the beliefs, the speculations, the religious worship, the life of the people to whom this religious message came. It enables us to trace the developement of their beliefs; it will probably be found, as our knowledge progresses, more accurate in detail than many recent writers would have us believe. From the religious point of view it is a great gain that, having accepted the position which we have laid down, we can approach the question of the dates of the Old Testament books, of the lines of developement of Judaism, of the mode or process through which the revelation came, of the growth of the Law and of many other problems, often complex and always interesting, with free and unbiassed minds. Nothing that a critic can discover need really frighten us. The value of the Old Testament is independent of the truth of particular historical facts. The period of bewilderment as regards the Old Testament is passing away.

The result, indeed, of critical and historical methods applied to the study of the Old Testament has been to solve more problems than it has raised. Every one acquainted with the history of thought in the early Church, when the Christian mind had first to approach the question of the Old Testament will know what difficult problems the study of it aroused. How could we reconcile the God of the Old Testament with the God of the New? The one said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; the other said, Love your enemies. The one was a just God, the other was a good God. There is no need for us to dwell now on the curious solutions that were offered to this problem: on Marcion's two Gods, on the rise of the allegorical method, on the developement of an unreal and unnatural interpretation of the Old Testament. Again, the early

Church was acquainted with the close analogy between Jewish customs and heathen rites, and faced the problem. The isolated mediaeval Church knew none of these things. But with the expansion of modern life, our acquaintance with other religious bodies, the growth of theories of historical developement, the study of comparative religion, all these problems surge up once more, and we cannot evade them. Then, again, we know the harm that has been done in some cases by making the Old Testament a rule of life instead of the New Testament. It is not only criticism, it is history and science and sociology, it is above all a study of the Gospel itself, that has transformed our conception of the Old Testament. We remember how it was for the hardness of the people's hearts that certain laws were made, that the old law shews the teaching of the people through the ideas of their time; we know that the Old Testament righteousness was imperfect, that the New Testament righteousness exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees. We recognize the Law as a schoolmaster leading men to Christ, with all the imperfections of a schoolmaster. We learn to look upon the Old Testament as the record of a Divine but progressive revelation; we realize that the world was taught then, as it is taught now, through the medium of existing ideas. Sacrifice was not a creation of the law; it was an existing custom, exalted and purified. We see how the idea of a sublime Monotheism was gradually built up for the world, and we interpret the Old Testament through its goal in Christ.

It is still a problem to many minds how the Old Testament is to be taught. The great bar to all religious sincerity in this as in many other directions is the "orthodoxy" of the unintelligent layman. Our churches are being emptied because we listen to the

demands of those who will not think or learn themselves, and would like to prevent other people from thinking. It may be suggested that the period for the conspiracy of silence, which has been much misrepresented and has done very great injury to many Christians, has now come to an end. We should teach the Old Testament boldly and truly. We should build up the belief of our people on its great moral ideas, on the growth and developement of a lofty conception of God, on the high morality of the prophets, on the value and function of the Levitical law as enshrining spiritual truth in a concrete form, on the consciousness of the people of Israel of its high destiny, on the Messianic expectation, on the wonderful fulfilment of their hopes. As regards children, there will be no difficulty if we teach them nothing that they need unlearn. Teach them first the New Testament. Teach them there the meaning of a parable. The time-honoured definition learnt in our National Schools is quite adequate: an earthly story with a heavenly meaning. And having taught them to realize that what is true is the meaning and not the story, you can easily transfer this conception to the Old Testament. Make them learn to ask, not whether the story is true, but what it means; and if they have that conception in their minds, the legendary portions of the Old Testament will fall into their proper places. If we do this, a great deal of that disillusionment and disbelief which arises among young men, when they grow up and begin to be conscious that some of the stories of the Old Testament that they used to believe are not true, will cease. They will never have been taught that they are true, and will not think that the truth of Christianity depends upon their truth.

II

The problem of the New Testament is not altogether analogous. The position, indeed, is to a certain extent more difficult. Our religion and creed are based upon certain historical facts, and to most of us there is a sense of unreality in the attempts that are made to build it up on the assumption that these are not true. What, then, is the foundation of these facts? How far are they removed from the sphere of historical uncertainty?

The years 1880–1890 were marked by the publication of two works which have profoundly affected the subsequent developement of English theology. One was *Lux Mundi*, the effect of which was openly to commit a large body of the Church to the acceptance of the modern critical position. The other was Bishop Lightfoot's edition of the writings of S. Ignatius. The latter work emphasized the absolute destruction of the principles of Biblical criticism which had prevailed in Germany for fifty years past, had been introduced into England, and were popularized in this country, just at the time when their inadequacy was becoming apparent, by the authoress of *Robert Elsmere*. There are still critics who attempt to place the books of the New Testament in the second century, but they have shut their eyes to the evidence. The two leaders in this return to sane criticism were Zahn in Germany and Lightfoot in England; and it is a striking testimony to the value of the work done in this country that Professor Harnack, in his book on the chronology of early Christian writings, should so largely have adopted the conclusions which our own writers have arrived at. There are points that are still uncertain; there are books the authorship of which is still a matter of dispute. But that the greater number of the books

of the New Testament were written before the close of the first century may be considered indisputable. Each year there is a smaller number of critics who refuse to accept the ten Epistles of S. Paul. Each year the Pastoral Epistles have a tendency to be treated with greater respect. To deny that S. Luke wrote the third Gospel and the Acts is becoming more difficult each day. The problem of the Johannine writings, it is true, is not yet solved, but there are few who would put these works later than the year 100. Doubts as to the authorship of II. Peter, Jude, and possibly the Epistle of S. James, must be allowed to remain.

Now this position which has been established means a good deal. We know what Christianity was as represented by S. Paul twenty years after the death of Christ. We know the narrative of the life of our Lord as it was written down by the second generation of Christians, and very much as it must have been told by the first. But that does not necessarily tell us what Christ was or what He really taught, and a new school of criticism has arisen which raises new doubts. It would distinguish the historical Christ from the Christ of the Gospels, and would suggest to us that the Christ of the Gospels is the creation of the Christian Church. Such a situation is full of difficulties, for it never tells us what created the Christian Church; and that is the real problem. But there are, I think, further difficulties concealed under this criticism. The Christian religion claims to be based on certain facts which are commonly called supernatural; and the real problem that is raised is, what evidence is sufficient to prove the credibility of supernatural, or, as I should prefer to call them, spiritual facts. Attempted reconstructions of the early history of Christianity and Lives of Christ which attempt to eliminate the miraculous and the abnormal

have been common enough, but they have all failed in providing an adequate cause for the real facts which undoubtedly happened. Let us, as in the case of the Old Testament, attempt to discover what may be looked upon as certain.

We can begin where we left off with the Old Testament. There we found that we had the history of a people whom actual historical circumstances marked out from other nations as a peculiar people. We found that they had a long period of historical developement; we found that they were conscious of a particular mission; that they were differentiated from the surrounding nations by higher moral and religious views; that there was gradually developed among them a religion and a creed which transcended all the other creeds of the ancient world; that they looked forward to the culmination of their history in the coming of one whom they described as the Messiah, and we found that in Christ the expectation which was thus raised has been fulfilled. We found a preparation, an expectation, a fulfilment. Is the connexion of Isaiah and Christ a mere coincidence? What spiritual force or power was sufficient to crown the history of the Jewish race?

Now let us take another point. Let us take some book the date and authorship of which are undoubted, for instance the two Epistles to the Corinthians. No sane critic doubts their genuineness, although some suppose, but unreasonably, that the Second Epistle is a combination of two or more genuine letters. We know within a year or two when they were written, we know who wrote them, we know the places from which they came. By means of them we are able to construct a very adequate picture of the life and teaching and discipline of the Christian Church as it existed about the middle of the first century. We have put before us its wonder-

ful moral ideals, the deep religious feeling, the enthusiasm and the life and the power of the new movement. Take one conception, that summed up by the phrase "in Christ," and consider all that it means. Realize the spiritual nature and force of S. Paul as it is disclosed in the self-revelation particularly of the Second Epistle. We are so used to the language that we fail to realize how wonderful it is. Then let us contrast that life as it is thus revealed to us with anything that had existed before. Let us take the highest product of pre-Christian thought, the ultimate attainments of philosophic paganism, and compare them with these works, and then let us ask ourselves, what power was capable of creating such a tremendous transformation of life? Whence came it that S. Paul was able to boast of the Cross of Christ, which was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness, but to him the power of God and the wisdom of God? Whence came that sublime conception of the Christian society as the Body of Christ? Whence came that great eulogy of Christian love or charity? How was it that the hopelessness of the heathen world was transformed into the glorious vision of the Resurrection? How did people come to accept the mystical language of the life in Christ? What power was sufficient to change and transform human life in this way?

Again, let us take the force and power of the Christian society. In an obscure corner of the Roman Empire, among a despised people, a religious teacher was unjustly condemned to death, and died as a malefactor on the cross. It was probably not a very unusual incident, and would not be likely to attract much public attention. Had you suggested to any capable or observant person of the time that that event was infinitely more important for the human race than the

whole of the reign of the Emperor Augustus, he would have looked upon you as mad. Had you told him that the Roman Empire would pass away and would be succeeded by a society built up round that event, he would have looked upon you as beside yourself. From that death on the cross there sprang a society which, at first small and insignificant, gradually spread until it had conquered the Empire itself; and this in spite of the fact that it was opposed by the most determined and ruthless persecution. It conquered the Empire, bringing in a new spirit of life in religion; then when the time came that the barbarian invaders attacked and overthrew the Empire, it conquered those barbarian invaders. It created amongst wild but vigorous races a great spiritual ideal; by that means it built up the mediaeval world, and through the force and power of this religion were created the new nations of modern Europe. Always in opposition, often attacked, apparently weak but really strong, it has been an undying source of spiritual influences; and now it is continuously working in new and different spheres, still often despised, still checked and thwarted, often apparently crushed and overthrown, but always pursuing its beneficent course. Whence came the spiritual power sufficient for such things? What cause was adequate to produce this tremendous force?

With these thoughts in our minds we turn back to the narrative of the Gospels, and there we find a cause given which is adequate. We read the life and teaching of Christ; we read the narrative of His death and resurrection; we read of the claims that He made and of the impression which He created on those who surrounded Him. There we have a sufficient, an adequate cause. If we had no Gospels we should have to re-create them for ourselves, to find a sufficient

starting-point for the spiritual forces that came into the world. One of the greatest of the truths which science and history alike teach us is that there must be a sufficient and adequate cause for all great events; and this is certainly true of Christianity. Even if it were the case, as was once suggested, that the New Testament writings were produced in the second century, we should still have to find an adequate cause for such a remarkable spiritual phenomenon as the existence of those writings and the Church which claimed them as its inspired work. When we examine the Gospel narrative we find that it contains such an adequate cause of the great events which followed. It presents a unique personality, it tells us that this great spiritual life was a revelation of God upon earth, it gives us the origin of the Christian Church, and explains the mission of that Church and whence and how it was able to fulfil it.

With these considerations before us we approach the study of the New Testament and its modern critics; and when we examine the latter we shall probably find that many arguments which they have put forward as critical are really *a priori*. We shall find that the reason why the events recorded in the Gospels are not accepted is not that the evidence is inadequate, but that they are of the kind which are incredible if we approach them with certain pre-suppositions. It is these pre-suppositions that we have to remove, and this we can do by realizing the power of the spiritual conceptions which Christianity created in the world. If we realize this we shall not have the same difficulties which we should have if we approached from a more one-sided point of view.

Criticism has its part to play and its duty to fulfil. It gives us an account of the books of the Bible, and tells us how to interpret them in a scholarly, historical and intelligent way. So read, they give us strong

evidence for the great truths of Christianity as we have inherited them and as we have taught them. On the other hand they give very little support to all those differences outside the historical creeds which have so often caused trouble and dissension among Christians. No scholar can draw from the New Testament conclusive proof of Calvinism or Arminianism or Lutheranism or Anglicanism or Romanism. He will not be able to build up rigid theories about the Sacraments or the ministry. He will not find ground for condemning people for minor aberrations from what he holds to be true; but he will be able to find a basis on which he can construct a sound creed and a wholesome rule of life and a wide and comprehensive Christian society.

III

The conflict between religion and science has sometimes been quoted as a reflection upon religion, and a sign of the mental incapacity of religious minds. The accusation is one that cannot really be maintained. There is nothing either unnatural or improper in the fact that, when a body of new truths are introduced which seem to be opposed to accepted and wholesome and cherished opinions, they should be at first received with incredulity. The scientific opposition to the doctrine of evolution was just as strong as the religious. There were thoughtful theologians like Church who accepted it immediately, just as there were leading scientific men like Owen who denied it. Nor can the tone and temper of some of the pioneers of scientific innovation be pardoned. If, as was sometimes the case, they put forward their discoveries as acceptable because they were at variance with current religious opinion, it was natural that they should receive, and

they certainly deserved, the opposition of organized religion; and that opposition would continue until men's thoughts had become clearer and the limitations of science had been recognized. There is, too, much in what the last fifty years have brought to justify the warnings of an older generation. Science has tried, and is trying, to find a scientific basis for morality which shall be independent of religion, and a scientific rule of life, and it has signally failed in its attempt. It has attempted to tamper with education, and it is already apparent that it has little to give to train the character or even the understanding. It has made sundry attempts to build up a purely scientific philosophy, and has only succeeded in shewing how little it realizes the questions at issue. As the limitations and possibilities of scientific inquiry become gradually more clear, it becomes apparent that no discovery that has been made, or that could possibly be made, need interfere with any rational belief. It is equally clear that there is a pseudo-scientific philosophy which does interfere with theological belief, and makes professions that it has signally failed to justify. It is not science, but some form of metaphysics that science has taken to itself, which is inconsistent with religion, and the ultimate synthesis can only be arrived at by a vigorous criticism of this pseudo-science by religion, as of religion by science.

It was natural that at first attempts should be made to reconcile the Bible and science. People had been so used to a doctrine of verbal inspiration, and to drawing their scientific knowledge from the Bible, that when the discoveries of geology first became widely known it was natural to find them concealed in the first chapter of Genesis. So a period of unreal harmonizing began. Geology was interpreted to square with what the Bible was believed to say, and the Bible with geology. The

process was not respectful to either authority; and gradually it has become clear that it is not beneficial religion to claim to prove the inspiration and value of the Bible by its agreement with the results of science. Whether we describe scientific knowledge as progressive or changing, it is certain that the conclusions of different periods will not agree with one another, and it may easily happen that we have produced, by means of some heroic exegesis, a conclusive proof that all the results of science are to be found in the Bible, only to find that science itself has advanced another step, and discovered that its earlier generalizations were imperfect. Are we again to revise our exegesis in order to prove that the new results can be found in the Bible?

But wise thought has recognized that this is not the right way. The Bible is intended to teach us religion, not science, or history, or criticism; and it may now be recognized that, throughout both the Old and the New Testaments, the science is the science of the writers' own time, that it gives us no scientific knowledge derived through any but ordinary human sources, and that it should not for this purpose be quoted as an authority. It is the religious and theological teaching of the first chapter of Genesis, not the scientific or the historical truth, that we are concerned with. As regards, then, the interpretation of the Bible, a sound theory of its purpose will leave us quite free in our investigation. The spheres of science and of religion do not collide. Science is free from the restrictions of religion; the religious interpretation of the facts is untouched by science. They deal with different spheres of human life. The supposed warfare, then, between religion and science, must be found, not in the relation of science to the Bible, but in the two aspects of the world which they represent. Does the scientific aspect of the universe

interfere with the truth of the religious aspect? And does this scientific point of view take away the validity of the arguments from the aspect of the material world in favour of a belief in God?

It has been a common tendency of recent years to find a place for Divine action in the gaps of scientific knowledge. It is pointed out that there is a gap which has never been bridged over between life and no life, that there is a gap between conscious thought and animal instinct; and here it is believed that there is evidence for direct Divine action. Now such a position is one which would naturally arise. It is a result from the lines on which developement of thought has proceeded. Gradually the domain of nature that exact science has annexed to itself has grown. In the eighteenth century there was developed the philosophy of Deism, which distinguished between the work of God and the reign of law. God had created the world, but law ruled it. It was natural, therefore, to find traces of the action of God in breaches of law or in gaps in law. Gradually, however, it has come to be felt that such a conception is unsound both from the theological and scientific point of view. From the point of view of science it is unsound because the scientific conception is that of an orderly developement of nature as a whole. It is true that the difference between life and non-life has never been defined. It is true that the bridge between them has never been passed by experiment. But for all that science is justified in believing that there is complete continuity between the two. The same laws of chemistry and of physics hold good in one domain as in the other; the same scientific principles prevail in both. And, as regards the developement of conscious thought, it must be remembered that the bridge between conscious and

unconscious life is passed in the case of every human being by a continuous and normal process. There are many points in the scientific chain of cause and effect which are not yet known ; but, however the conception of the uniformity of nature is attained, science is justified in relying on it, and that conception presents us with the world as a continuous series of events which, for convenience, we say are related to one another as cause and effect, and in which the same principles prevail which apparently always have prevailed throughout all observed phenomena. No doubt our knowledge of these is imperfect ; no doubt there is much for us to learn ; but the scientific idea of the world is one which is continually receiving new proofs from experience.

But if the idea that the work of God is shewn in the gaps of scientific knowledge is unsound scientifically, it is still more unsound theologically. It is unsound in the first place because the gaps in the scientific knowledge of one generation are often the triumphs of the next, and therefore it presents the most precarious basis on which to build. It is still more unsound because it is derogatory to our conception of God. The conception which science gives to theism of a great self-developing world is really one of extreme magnificence. But it destroys not only that conception, but our conception of the God whom we believe to be its Creator, if we believe that at some particular point of its developement God had to interfere in any particular way. To us Law is God and God is Law. We find God's action not here or there, but everywhere in the world. The whole process of the world as revealed to us by science is the work of God. And science can, so far as religion and theistic belief are concerned, work freely and unhampered in its study of the phenomena of the natural world as revealed through the senses.

But how far can we say that the world as interpreted by science witnesses to a God? Here I believe that the whole of modern scientific discovery has nothing to interfere with that belief, but rather intensifies it. Ever since men have thought about the world, the world as they have seen it has to many minds witnessed to a Creator. The older writers on natural history have dwelt on the marvellous adjustment of the different portions of the physical universe to one another, the evidence of design which seemed to appear everywhere, the ingenious contrivances for the protection of life and the supply of food, the manner in which different parts of the universe fitted one into another. They expatiated on the beauty of the universe, on the exquisite workmanship displayed, and they argued from the world of nature as they saw it to a God as First Cause, and from the evidence of design in the universe to a mind that created it. That which was rational could not have come out of that which was irrational.

When first the great conception of evolution began to be realized it filled men's minds; like other new discoveries, it monopolized thought and obscured any other point of view, and it seemed at once to some to have cut the ground away from under the defences of theism. All this nice adjustment of the universe was the result, not of purpose, but of survival. In old days we were told that the giraffe had been marvellously endowed by Providence with a long neck, so as to enable it to live in districts where the herbage was scanty and it was necessary to feed on trees. Now we are told that giraffes have long necks because those individuals whose necks were longer than those of others managed to survive a period of drought, and their characteristics were reproduced in their descendants. The wonderful world of nature was not devised in

accordance with any principle or purpose, but has come to be what it is because the primitive amoebae have gradually developed in different ways, suited to the different environments in which they found themselves, and filling a place in nature which happened to be void. Naturally such a far-reaching generalization as this, explaining the way in which nature has come to be what it is, filled men's minds, and filled them to the exclusion of other thoughts. But now that the novelty has worn away, the limitations of what has been discovered are apparent. When all is said, this new theory only tells us how the world has come to be what it is. The gradual process of developement may be known, but nothing more. Why it has come to be what it is, how it was that matter and life were such that they developed as they have done, what was the original cause and what is the end; all these are questions which are just as much unanswered as ever.

Is it not infinitely more wonderful, we may reasonably ask, that a world should have been devised capable of developing as it has done? To the ordinary thinker it would be wonderful if a Creator had devised and planned the infinite variety of life and called it into being in the way which the narrative of Genesis suggests—

> The Earth obeyed, and straight,
> Opening her fertile womb, teemed at a birth
> Innumerous living creatures, perfect forms
> Limbed and full-grown—

if He had formed them out of the earth as one who models in clay, and breathed into their nostrils the breath of life; but is it not still more wonderful, the theist may say, that He should have created the world so that it should have itself, by the original laws of its

nature, come to be what it is? As a final result of the universe as we know it there comes man, endowed with powers of reason and forethought and wisdom, able consciously to change and direct the world in which he lives. He is rational; the universe appears to him to be rational. Did this great rational scheme come into being by chance, or does it bear witness to a Creator who represents the Reason which had worked itself out in the world? Probably the answer of most people to the question would be that there must be a rational cause for a rational universe.

Now there are difficulties in this argument, difficulties that we shall touch upon shortly; but these objections are in no way scientific, they are entirely metaphysical. They are not touched by any new discoveries of science. The point which it is important to make at the present moment is this—that the argument from a First Cause and that from design in nature, are just as sound and just as true now as they ever were. They are not interfered with by evolution; if anything, their power has become more cogent. And further than that, we may say quite confidently that no discoveries of science can affect them, because the clear limits of scientific investigation have become apparent. Science only tells us the how: it never tells us the why. It may quite easily map out for us the whole process of nature more completely than it has done. It may bridge over the gap that separates organic from inorganic phenomena. It may present the whole developement of the universe as one continuous process; it may discover more and more the secondary causes of things. But no discovery that it makes or can make can tell us anything on scientific grounds either of the origin or the purpose, the end or the first cause of the world that we know.

We are, in fact, in a position to lay down limits to

science. Within those limits it is supreme: without those limits it has no authority. Within those limits it is jealous, and rightly jealous, of the interference either of religion or metaphysics, or of authority in any form. Without those limits it has no right to step. It describes the process of nature; it describes the effect of phenomena either separately or combined with one another; and, using the word in a very limited sense, it investigates in that way the causes of things. It finds that the same cause or combination of phenomena has invariably the same effect, and hence it builds up its *laws*—a term which is convenient for use, but is dangerous, because, like all other metaphysical terms, it necessarily carries with it other connotations. This process of investigation it carries on with all the phenomena that come before it. In some cases it has been successful in its investigations, in other cases less successful. It believes that our mental powers are a legitimate subject of investigation equally with the natural world, but it has not yet proceeded very far in this branch of its subject. There is not, however, any reason to limit its action in any direction, provided that it is recognized that it investigates phenomena and not reality, and that its power and certainty only arise from the limited sphere of its work.

IV

So far we have carefully abstained from touching on the metaphysical problem. We have taken the point of view of the plain man. The plain man has his reasons for thinking that there must be a God because he feels that there must be an adequate cause for the things that he sees, and he thinks that such a cause is an adequate one. For a time he was bewildered by the

high-sounding phrase Evolution; but now he has recovered from the shock, and he finds out that he is really in much the same position that he was before, and that nothing has been discovered by scientific research which should interfere with the value, whatever it may be, of the argument that we have sketched above.

But now comes in the metaphysician, and his message is bewildering alike to the man of science and to the plain man. For he tells them, without any doubt or hesitation, that they have neither of them any real knowledge at all, that what they think is proof is only opinion, that reality is something that they cannot attain to. With the creed of the materialist he deals very plainly. He tells him that he is only studying phenomena, that he has no knowledge of things in themselves; his attempt to argue that matter must exist, and that mind was evolved out of matter, is to put the cart before the horse, for the knowledge of mind precedes that of matter. About matter in itself we know nothing at all; all that we have any knowledge of is our own sensations. Matter is merely something that you imagine exists as a cause of your sensations; but it is as much an invention of your own mind as that idea of God which you affect to despise. If you think a moment you will see that this is true. You speak of colour, but colour has no existence in things at all; it is merely a sensation of your eyes caused by the incidence of certain rays of light. It exists as colour only in relation to the person who sees. Space, extension, time, have no existence apart from your ideas of them. We know nothing of matter except as the product of our mind. Science is but the attempt to explain a portion of the furniture of our minds, and therefore it can give no adequate philosophy unless it

studies the whole of that content. Your science is of no value except within the sphere of sensational experience.

But metaphysics, having proved to the man of science that he is dealing, as Plato would say, with the non-existent, turns to the plain man and tells him that his argument for belief in God is no argument at all. It is merely an argument from his own experience. He thinks of himself as cause, and therefore he argues that there must be a cause of things of a similar character. But his rational powers and methods of argument are, so far as we know, only valid within the sphere of experience, and outside that sphere we have no evidence of their validity. Nor is there any real cogency, he says, in your arguments. Only think things out far enough, and you will be landed in self-contradiction. Your dogmatic proof of the existence of a deity is quite invalid. Your mental power is adequate within the sphere in which it works; it is quite inadequate beyond that sphere.

So far the metaphysician is purely destructive. Can he reconstruct? Can he give us any means of attaining a real knowledge of what we desire to know—the purpose and reason and cause of our existence? Can he enable us in any way to find out what things really are like? We are all of us acquainted, no doubt in a somewhat imperfect and second-hand manner, with the negative arguments of Kant, by which he overthrew the older dogmatists, and also with the positive arguments by which he reconstructed the theistic belief as a postulate of the practical reason. It may be suggested that this last part of his theory lays down certain lines on which we may attempt to obtain some knowledge of reality.

The first business of the metaphysician or of the philosopher is to make it clear how the problem of life

as a whole is to be approached. His investigation must begin with himself; he only knows anything in and through himself. His business is to analyze and explain, so far as he can, his experience; and his experience divides itself into two elements. First of all there is the experience of the world, of which he yet experiences himself as a member; and secondly, there is the experience of himself as apart from the world; and the problem is to reconcile the two. In the world he is caused, but he knows himself as a cause; in the world he seems to be under the rule of necessity, but he knows himself as free; in the world his actions are conditioned, he knows himself as conditioning. He is in the world but yet outside the world and able to study it. That is the problem of knowledge. How can a man be outside the world and know the world of which he is himself a part? More than that, he has other parts of his mental framework to explain—his moral sense, his aesthetic sense; hence the investigations cover a wide field. Science, natural science, psychology, logic, morals, aesthetics—all these the philosopher has to explain, and it is his business to see that his theory of life adequately covers the whole ground.

But if he gives us an explanation, what is its value? What is its logical validity? That is laid down by Kant when speaking of the practical reason. To us his methods seem to be capable of extension. So long as his argument was directed against the attempts of the older dogmatists to prove the existence of God as a proposition of Euclid, it was sound. But surely the same method which he applied to the practical reason will really apply to the explanation of the whole of life. We cannot prove that God exists as we can prove a mathematical theory, but we may still feel that for us a belief in God is the most rational explanation. We

cannot prove that mind exists apart from matter; but the hypothesis that it does so is the only method which will explain the validity of human reason. We cannot prove that that reason is of the same nature as the Divine cause; but the correspondence between our knowledge of things and the actual order of things can only be explained by supposing that the source of our reason is the source of things. We cannot, as Kant would tell us, prove the reality of judgement, of immortality, of God; but the hypothesis of their reality is the only rational explanation of the existence of the moral law and of conscience. To many of us it becomes clearer as we ponder over the problem that, although we cannot demonstrate in a logical manner, as some would like to do, the existence of a God, yet there is no other explanation of the existence of the universe, and of ourselves in the universe, which carries to us any weight except that hypothesis.

And have we any corroborative argument for that belief? The great strength of science, its logical and its practical force alike, lies in its power of verification. The existence of the nautical almanac is, after all, overwhelming proof of the truths of mathematics and of astronomy. Is it not the case that the same is true of other forms of speculation? There is at the present time a curious developement of philosophy which calls itself Pragmatism. It starts apparently from an agnostic position. We cannot know anything about the reality of our life: we only know phenomena. But we know that certain beliefs are harmful, that certain beliefs are beneficial; therefore we must agree to believe what is beneficial, and if religious beliefs are found to be of practical value for life we must agree to accept them. Now this is a position which in itself is disastrous. By building up our practical beliefs on the bankruptcy of

our minds, we take away from our hands the great weapon that has existed in the past and is of service in the present for defending us from inadequate beliefs. We may all admit that our knowledge is imperfect and inadequate, but a necessary condition of thinking is to believe that we can get better knowledge. If we are asked to believe that there is no knowledge at all, then we despair of attaining to it. It is good for us to believe that here we see as in a mirror darkly, but we also believe that the reflection in that mirror represents some sort of truth. Plato represents his dwellers in the cave as seeing only the shadows of what passed, but those shadows are the shadows of reality. Pragmatism would banish from us any belief that we can really attain to knowledge, or that we have any means of discerning on rational grounds whether our knowledge is true, and therefore it might quite well be used to support every exploded and dangerous superstition. The argument which is now used in favour of this or that form of current religion might equally well have been used in favour of the gods of Greece and Rome.

But though pragmatism as a theory of knowledge is most unsound, yet it conceals a truth which is valuable. The verification of a scientific theory lies in its practical application. If it does not work in practice we go back and find what mistake we have made. The verification of a philosophic theory must equally lie in its influence upon life. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Just as we believe in the discoveries of the physicist because we can send a message by electricity, so the working of a religion or philosophy tests its validity, and suggests to us whether it is sound or harmful; and if we find it harmful we immediately investigate our belief from a rational point of view and find out where it is imperfect. A great deal

is written now to shew the practical value and the necessity of religious belief for the good of human life. That argument, so far as it goes, makes us acquiesce in the belief that our creed is true. But as a matter of fact there is a great deal also written about the harmful effect of certain forms of religion, and therefore we have to examine them to see where the error lies. The difficulty of dealing with the whole of the matter arises, of course, from the extraordinary complexity of the character of the evidence. It is only over a comparatively long period of time that you can really test the validity of philosophical theories. Yet the history of human thought does provide us with a large amount of data and a considerable amount of experience. We know that certain religions or forms of religion have seemed to be harmful in the past, and we have therefore reinvestigated them to see whether they are untrue. Of course in real life the process cannot be defined so accurately. But logical methods may be analyzed in this way.

I would suggest, therefore, as the prolegomena to dealing with metaphysical questions the following results of this investigation: first, that the metaphysical analysis of human experience shews us the inadequacy of any materialistic explanation of the universe; secondly, that the same method of investigation makes us see that there can be no demonstrative proof of the existence of a God on the basis of human reason; thirdly, that it is the business of the metaphysician to provide, if possible, an adequate explanation of the facts of human experience taken as a whole; and that that explanation must be one which will explain not only the facts of the material world, but the facts of our mind, of our moral nature, of our sense of beauty; fourthly, that metaphysics has continually to

be readjusting its explanation because the progress of the human mind and of rational investigation shews the inadequacy of some of its theories. Here, as elsewhere, indeed the insight has not been entirely progressive; for there have been great minds at different periods whose insight has been deeper than that of many who have come after. Lastly, we have a continual corrective of the theories which have been put forward to explain the phenomena of the world as we know it in the practical application of those theories. Experience has shewn that many of them are not only inadequate as explanations of life, but have also been harmful as guides to life. On the other hand, certain groups of opinions have been proved to have a beneficial effect when working over a long period, and this suggests that so far the conclusions of reason are legitimate, though we recognize that they may be imperfect.

V

The drift of the foregoing arguments is to suggest that rational thought is on the side of theistic belief, and that modern discovery has done nothing to interfere with that belief. If there be a God, it is reasonable to believe that He must have revealed Himself to the world and given mankind the power to learn of His existence and fulfil His will, and we have seen reason to suggest that there is evidence for a special revelation through the Christian religion. We believe, therefore, that the most rational explanation of the universe is that of the theist and the Christian, and we believe that experience has justified our maintenance of this belief.

But then the further question comes to people, But what is Christianity? The impartial inquirer is con-

fronted, or thinks that he is confronted, by the conflicting claims of a large number of different religious bodies, and theoretically he is exposed to great difficulties. As a matter of fact, the difficulty is only in particular instances great, since the claims of Christianity come upon most people through the medium of one particular religious body, that in which they have been born or that through which the knowledge of Christianity has been first brought to them. The question does not easily run in that abstract form. But still the question does occur from time to time: How far do the existing religious bodies, or any of them, represent Christianity? Which represents it most adequately? Which, if any, of the various churches or societies can claim to be the truest representative of that Church which Christ founded?

The discussion of this question is one which is especially difficult at the present time, because among many minds there is a good deal of superficial scepticism as to the necessity of the inquiry at all. It is maintained that the various forms of Christianity are matters of indifference, and doubts are expressed as to the validity of the arguments used to prove the correctness of any particular form of Christianity. There is an impatience with the methods of careful historical research or exegesis which seem to be demanded, and doubts are suggested as to whether arguments based upon the authenticity of writings of the first or second century can be of very great value to the present day. All such criticisms are very superficial. There are, as a matter of fact, few people who really believe that there is no difference between different religious bodies, and that it does not matter to which a man belongs. Many people who say that sort of thing will follow it up shortly by a vigorous attack on the Church of Rome or

some other conspicuous religious body. In this sphere, as much as in natural science, it is only by careful investigation and thought that truth can be attained. Christianity is a historical religion, the records of its teaching come through historical documents, and the only method of arriving at what it is must be through the study of the authentic documents which describe its foundation, or the study of its history. Both alike demand the most careful historical investigation, scholarly knowledge and a keen intellect. It is just as impossible to reconstruct Christianity by *a priori* methods of investigation as to carry on the study of natural history according to the mediaeval method of evolving our material out of our inner consciousness.

The present writer starts from a natural *praejudicium* which is created by being a member of the English Church. He no more approaches the question with an open mind than a member of the Roman or of the Nonconformist bodies. But it has been his duty to investigate for himself the authority and the status of the Church to which he belongs. It is a confession which at the present day it may be very unfashionable to make, that the result of his investigations has been to strengthen his conviction that the Church of England is an adequate though not an infallible representative of the Christian society, and in particular that the logical position on which the Church rests is sound. It is the custom to believe that the English Church is the creation of political compromise. That position I believe to be entirely untrue. The principle of the English Church is that its standard of truth is the Old and the New Testaments as interpreted by Christian history and tradition. The actual process pursued at the English Reformation was not to attempt to re-

construct the Church anew from the beginning, but to cut away such mediaeval abuses and accretions as had been shewn to be without authority and harmful. In both cases the principle seems to my mind absolutely sound. The method of reform was the right one, and the result, historical continuity combined with adaptation to the needs of the day, represents the combination of the two principles of government which are most essential to the well-being of a nation and of a church.

The idea that the principles of the Church of England are not logical has arisen from a certain confusion of ideas. It is quite true that these principles have probably not always been applied quite logically ; that political compromise, or historical ignorance, or the influence of other religious bodies, or insular peculiarities, have produced inconsistencies in detail. Such I believe to be the case. There are details in the Prayer Book which are not entirely consistent with the principle on which the Church was founded, and which prove the influence of outside bodies. But it is one thing to say the principle has not always been logically applied, and another thing to say that it is illogical in itself. I believe that the latter statement is entirely untrue, and that, as against either the Roman or the Protestant position, the principles of the Church of England represent, not an illogical political compromise, but a sound and healthy mean.

The present essays contain only one direct contribution to that issue, but this touches on a point of considerable importance. The fact of historical interest and the accident of foreign travel drew my attention to the position and teaching of the Eastern Church, and it has always seemed to me that up to

a certain point the existence of that branch of the Church is a fact of paramount importance, which ought to be kept firmly before our minds. Of the various criticisms which may be directed against that Church I am well aware. I am quite conscious that in many ways it represents a very antiquated form of Christianity, quite inadequate to the needs of the day. That arises from the accidents of its history, which have impressed upon it its conservative character. I have no delusions as to any immediate hopes of reunion. But I am convinced of the very great importance of the witness of the Eastern Church as to the history and character of Christianity. That position which the Church of England arrived at independently, and upon which it based its Reformation, is substantially the position which the Eastern Church has preserved from primitive times, and this seems to me to be a fact of great importance.

Nor can I hold that it was in any way accidental that the English Reformation took the form that it did. No doubt political circumstances assisted. If it had not been for Queen Mary, we might have remained in union with the Church of Rome. If it had not been for Cromwell and for Somerset, we might have been Protestant. But I believe that the influence of the early Oxford Reformers, of Colet and Linacre and Erasmus, the influence, that is, of sober and wise learning, was one of those which prevailed as an under-current throughout all the Reformation period, at times submerged under the fierce current of political controversy and religious fanaticism, but rising again in the creation of the Anglican school of divinity; and that it is this learning which is responsible for the form of the Church of England.

It is with the hope that it may never be forgotten

that religion, while it does not consist in learning only, but means life and work and devotion, must always be able to appeal to the intellect, that I have written. Our Church must realize as fully in the present as it has done in the past that we can only have a sound faith if we have an educated clergy in close contact with all the teaching of modern thought and inspired by sober historical knowledge.

II

THE SOURCES AND AUTHORITY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY[1]

I

ANY one who at the present day is appointed a professor of Dogmatic Theology will find himself confronted with a task which has within recent years immensely increased in difficulty. To a large number of persons the branch of knowledge which he professes appears to be something quite useless and unreal. Its name has an offensive ring; it deals with a subject-matter which is held to have no existence except in words, and to have no relation to the actual realities of life; and the sources of this supposed knowledge are held to be destitute of any claims to authority.

It is difficult to estimate how far in popular conception a prejudice may be created by a name. No doubt theologians have often been improperly dogmatic in defence of incorrect opinions, just as many men of science were very improperly dogmatic against the dogma of evolution. The only popular use of the word "dogmatic" is as an epithet condemning a certain

[1] Delivered as an Inaugural Lecture as Principal and Professor of Dogmatic Theology at King's College, University of London, October 1903, and published by Macmillan and Co., Ltd., in the same year.

habit of mind, and to many persons the phrase "dogmatic theology" comes inevitably with a number of associations which are quite adventitious. A professor of science who discusses the principles of science would be looked upon with suspicion if his subject were called dogmatic science, and if a professor of dogmatic theology were said to lecture on the "truths" or "principles" of theology, a good deal of quite uncalled for opposition would be disarmed. Yet, as it is hardly necessary to add, this would be a perfectly correct description of his work. His business is to investigate, to expound and to systematize those truths about God and human destiny, whether derived from nature or revelation, which should be believed. A dogma means a truth to be believed, and the term is just as much applicable to the truths of science as of theology.

But it will be argued at once—Science deals with realities, Theology deals only with a system of words and ideas. It is concerned with a number of controversies about things which have no relation at all to human life. Such an attitude may have been partially justified from an inadequate representation of theology, or from that want of perspective which comes from confusing the words and formulas on which controversy has turned with the fundamental truths which are really its subject-matter. A very little consideration will shew that, although it may be true that many controversies have been unnecessary, and that an excessive love of definitions seems sometimes to have obscured the main issue, yet a theology which is undogmatic is impossible. It may be quite right that our beliefs should be simpler and less well-defined than were those of the Schoolmen, but even the most rudimentary discussion on religious or moral

topics implies a dogmatic belief. We may banish the Apostles' Creed, but the first two words of the Lord's Prayer are meaningless unless we have a theology. We cannot in any real sense use these words unless we believe in the existence of God, and in that relationship between Him and mankind which is generally expressed theologically by the phrase "The Fatherhood of God." But in these two propositions we have all the elements of a very wide and far-reaching theology.

The subject-matter of theology includes the existence and nature of God; the source and extent of man's knowledge of God; the relation of man to God; the relation of God to man; the aim and destiny of human life. It is obvious that the answers to questions on subjects such as these are, and must be, of tremendous importance for men. All human life and conduct turns on them. It is necessary here, as much as elsewhere, to have careful and exact thinking, and so long as language continues to be the vehicle for the expression of human thought to have accurate language for the expression of thought.

It is quite true that there have been periods when dogmatic theology has got into a narrow groove and has been divorced from the realities of human life, but the same can be said of philosophy, of science, of literature and of classical scholarship. That, however, is no reason for supposing that shallow thought and slovenly expression can be a substitute for trained thinking. A steam-engine can never be constructed by popular science, although science may be quite capable of popular expression; and the life and conduct of a nation can never be regulated by inexact thinking, although a preacher must be able to expound the teaching he is attempting to realize in language that his hearers can understand.

I do not believe that any thoughtful person, who is prepared in any way to admit the claims of religion, will really think that dogmatic theology is unnecessary. Religion is the most powerful force in the elevation of human life, and it must be of the greatest importance that the religious beliefs should be healthy and true. But a second objection is not that theology is useless, but that however useful it may be it is untrue; that the sources from which it is derived are destitute of authority. A theologian in older days found a comparatively straightforward and simple task before him. He had certain documents, the Old Testament, the New Testament, and if he were a high churchman the Fathers, and he might use them very much in the way that a lawyer uses his cases. He could build up his theology by citing authorities. Difficulty and controversy might and did arise as to the exact limits of the authority and the interpretation of its meaning, but the authority and sources of his teaching were invariably accepted. But a theologian nowadays, if he is to win at all a wide acceptance for his conclusions, must begin by a very careful examination of his sources. He will no longer find anything taken for granted. There was controversy between Romanist, Protestant and Anglican as to the exact authority of the Fathers, but all alike would agree on the authority of Scripture. Now it is just that authority which is not only attacked by outsiders, but doubted largely by theologians themselves. The real question (often concealed by subsidiary controversies) is what ground have we for believing that the system of belief based upon the Bible is true? In what sense can we rely upon it as the main source of our knowledge of Divine things?

As an introduction to a course of lectures on dogmatic theology, a review becomes necessary of the results

of human thought and knowledge, so far as they affect our religious beliefs. It is claimed that changes have been produced by the discoveries of science, by the criticism of philosophy, by the application of historical methods to the study of the Old and New Testaments, and by the altered view which recent investigation gives us of the growth and developement of the theology of the Church. It is these questions that I propose to consider.

II

What is the influence of the discoveries of Natural Science on Religious Belief? Some persons would tell us that, if we only knew it, science has made religion in any real sense of the word impossible. It has evolved a new theory of the universe in which there is no room for a Divine being; it has completely changed our ideas of human motive, and will shortly formulate, if it has not done so already, a new standard of conduct. I need not say that I do not believe this. To my mind, the discoveries of science not only do not, but cannot, touch the fundamental truths of religion; they deal with quite a different sphere of things. So far as they have changed our view of the world it is to substitute a really religious view for the old half-mythological conceptions, while for the control of conduct religious principles are as necessary as they ever have been.

Science, as I understand it, starts, and in this it differs from metaphysics, with taking the world as it is. It assumes within its own sphere the validity of our human intelligence, and the reality of the external world as a practical hypothesis, and it is quite content with the verification of its results which experience gives. It deals with the world of which we have knowledge

directly or indirectly through the senses; it assumes that (for its purpose) that knowledge, although limited, is adequate. It investigates the character of this world of which we have cognisance by our senses, and applies, often very successfully, the result of its investigations to the amelioration of human life. Now, working on this basis, what has it achieved?

Using popular language, and recognizing the limitations of that language, we may say that science has taught us the Reign of Law[1] in the universe; that the whole visible universe has grown to be what it is by the working and developement of what are in themselves

[1] A friend, to whose criticisms I was indebted, criticizes the use that I have made of the term "Law": "Do we gain much or anything by using 'popular language'? It is true that the 'Reign of Law' summarizes to the popular mind the distinctive achievement of modern science, but the moment one asks what this means we get away from the conception of Law as the plain man understands it, and as you, in condescension to his weakness, make use of it. He thinks of Law as something regulative and imposed *ab extra*. But science has, I think, definitely made this conception impossible. It finds and knows no separate or separable laws—only matter and energy in indissoluble connection. The world as science represents it is not made up out of matter governed by law, but by energetic matter, which acts, not by direction from without, but by the energies of its own nature." And he would ask the same question as I do in the following form: "Is this world of dynamic reality self-existent, and can we explain from it human nature?"

I need not say that with the substance of this criticism I entirely concur. Laws of Nature are not laws in the sense of direction from without, but, as is stated in the lecture, only observed uniformities. But there is no other expression yet produced which will adequately express the idea science wishes to convey, and I find it used by every scientific writer whose books or articles I have read. I should not have been clear to most of my hearers if I did not use the word. Nor, so far as I am aware, is there any point in my argument which depends upon reading into the word Law associations which are not legitimate. It is quite true that all that science knows as yet is that the same things happen in the same circumstances. But how have things come to be such that by the same things happening in the same circumstances a universe has come into being which appears to a mind that is rational to be itself rational?

singularly simple laws or ascertained uniformities; and that, while the greater our knowledge of the universe the more wonderful its complexity appears, the greater the advance of science the simpler do we find the laws of its working. The difference between the old conception and the new might be shewn by one instance. According to the former, every individual species in the animal and vegetable kingdom could only be accounted for by a special creation, a special manifestation of Divine power. Modern science, by the powers of the microscope, has revealed to us organic nature as something infinitely more complex than anything we had ever conceived; but at the same time it tells us that all this infinite complexity has been developed, by the action of quite simple laws and by processes which are continually being better understood, from the individual organic cell of an amoeba-like animal. There is no room for any special creation. There are gaps in our knowledge still to fill up, gaps which may never be filled up, but scientific imagination, passing it is true out of the region of proved conclusions, has clearly conceived the possibility of reducing all our knowledge of nature to one single principle. It assumes the developement of the whole solar system from some primaeval vapour, the developement of life from the chemical combination of physical substances, the developement of man from the lower animals. It would maintain that the chain of developement is continuous, and that there is probably no room anywhere for any special manifestation of creative power. Somehow or other life has come out of matter and mind out of life in ways which we may not be able to understand, but which are for all that simply natural processes.

But if we ask the origin or the cause of the universe, to that science can give no answer. All such problems

are, so far as it is concerned, just as much unsolved as ever. It shews us a wonderful process continuously working, but the origin of that process remains unknown. The old question remains, but has to be asked differently. We no longer ask, what intelligence was sufficient to make the world as it is, but what intelligence was sufficient to initiate and inspire a universe which could come to be what it is. In all these discoveries there is nothing which militates against the belief in a God, a Divine intelligence, as Creator. It is just as true as ever it was to say that our mind cannot conceive the existence of the universe without a cause for its existence; it cannot conceive the existence of what bears so strongly the marks of being rational without believing it the creation of intelligence; it cannot conceive the existence of mind without a Cause which is infinitely more rational than the Reason which has sprung from its creation. To me the more wonderful Nature is shewn to be, the more infinitely complex in its manifestations, the more simple in its laws, so much the more does it lead back to the necessary belief in a Creator, a Divine Reason, who through the countless ages has been working in and through the laws by which He is making the universe, whose Divine power has been shewn, not in the breaches of a physical law, which is looked upon as something outside Himself, but in the working of the Law which is His creature, His servant, the manifestation of His Being. Metaphysics may still be able to criticize, as it has criticized in the past, the validity of this argument, but science cannot, for it is beyond the limits of science; and scientific research has not made it less but more cogent, for it has revealed a manifestation of Divine power far more worthy of its Divine origin than any which the human mind had hitherto conceived.

I am not of course prepared to assert either that

life is but a higher manifestation of force, or that the human mind has been evolved directly out of life. What I do feel is that the utmost possible developement of science in this direction is not anything to be conceded grudgingly, that a basis for Christian apologetics ought not to be found in the present limitations of science, for its present limitations are often its future triumphs. The more science can discover, the greater will become the need of the Divine Creator to be the source and guide of the universe, not the less. Nor, again, does it seem to me that there is any reason to limit the manifestation of Divine power to organic life. We may know perfectly and accurately the laws in accordance with which a crystal is formed, and may understand completely its molecular construction, but that should not blind us to the fact that the wonderful thing is that there should be laws (or whatever we call them) by which the crystal is produced. The thought of this demands an adequate explanation as much as the complicated structure of the human eye, and the adequate explanation must be one which recognizes the element of reason.

Such a conception of Nature as we have had in our mind does not banish the idea of a God working in and through the universe any more than it banishes the idea of God as a Creator. Although there is a physical cause for every phenomenon, and because that cause is a general law, the whole infinitely complicated scheme of the universe may equally in every detail and in the whole scheme represent the workings of an infinite intelligence.

The controller of a complicated piece of machinery always works by mechanical laws; but any movement of that machinery is the direct result of a controlling mind, which attains its aim, not by interfering with but by

using the mechanical appliances, and so the whole universe may quite well be looked upon on one side as simply the outcome of the working of certain well-known laws (as we call them), but regarded from the other, be simply the manifestation of an infinite intelligence. Whether this be so or not may demand further proof, or perhaps be incapable of proof; what I am at present concerned to maintain is that no discovery which science has yet made, and no discovery which it is conceivable that it could make, in any way interferes with such a conception. The religious aspect of the universe is not something antagonistic to the scientific aspect, but something quite consistent with it. It does not require a different set of facts, but is merely a different way of looking at the same facts.[1]

[1] It used to be held that the proper way to reconcile science and theology was to divide their spheres—God made certain things, and Nature did the rest. This was a conception which adequately satisfied both the theology and the science of the eighteenth century; but science informs us that this is now an impossible theory, and, in doing so, is only re-echoing an older and better theology.

This is how Sir Oliver Lodge writes ("Reconciliation between Science and Faith," *Hibbert Journal*, I. 2, p. 214):—

"Is it, then, so simple? Does the uniformity and the eternity and the self-sustainedness of it make it the easier to understand? Are we so sure that the guidance and control are not really continuous, instead of being, as we expected, intermittent? May we not be looking at the working of the Manager all the time and at nothing else? Why should He step down and interfere with Himself? That is the lesson science has to teach theology—to look for the action of the Deity, if at all, then always; not in the past alone, nor only in the future, but equally in the present. If His action is not visible now, it never will be, and never has been visible."

I must take exception to the words "science has to teach theology." I should rather put it, "science may learn from theology." At any rate such a doctrine was taught by Thomas Aquinas many hundreds of years before science thought of it. In the *Summa contra Gentiles de Unitate Catholicae Fidei*, III. lxvii.—lxx., he argues, first, that all things work through the power of God, *omne igitur operans operatur per virtutem Dei.* But this does not take away their proper action from created things, *non igitur auferimus proprias actiones rebus creatis, quamvis omnes effectus*

I think that I am justified in quoting, as agreeing with what has been said so far (although probably he would not accept all that I have to say), some words of one of our scientific professors :

" When we know," he writes, " that the protoplasmic folk who spin, though lacking wheels, and weave, though wanting looms, without intercommunication or moving from the place where each is chained—when I understand that each lays down his microscopical length of thread in the precise manner needed and designed by the idea of the whole, formulated by the will of the Law governing the life of each working cell, we are silent in deep worship of this eternal, ever revealing Law, in whose service we men and women are also enlisted. We hardly then dare exclaim, ' How beautiful ! ' but fall silently on our knees as if in tacit prayer to the Unknown for some closer touch with its infinite life." [1]

There are other aspects of the relation of science and theology which might be discussed. All that I wish at this point to contend is that scientific discovery cannot interfere with the realm of theology. So far as theology is concerned science is absolutely free ; and so far as science is concerned theology may pursue its own way.

rerum creatarum Deo attribuamus quasi in omnibus operanti. For it is not that things are done partly by natural, partly by Divine causes. In every action both causes are complete. *Patet etiam quod non sic idem effectus causae naturali et divinae virtuti attribuitur quasi partim a Deo, partim a naturali agente fiet, sed totus ab utroque secundum alium modum sicut idem effectus totus attribuitur instrumento et principali agenti etiam totus.* No doubt the science of the Schoolman would seem strangely expressed nowadays ; but for theology to claim that God is everywhere and is always Himself working in and through natural causes is not a novel doctrine, made to meet an apologetic need, but has always been part of its teaching.

[1] *The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect*, by Greville Macdonald, M.D., p. 104.

Science can produce no valid argument against the existence of a God, nor do the further discoveries of science alter in any real way the position of the question. At the same time it is true that scientific investigation has made it very hard for many men of science to believe. A friend of mine of considerable scientific attainments once said to me, "I do not believe that science proves anything contrary to the truth of religion, or, indeed, of Christianity; but it is true that the study of science makes it very difficult indeed for most of us to believe." These words, I think, express exactly the truth. Just as to the mediaeval hagiologist who compiled the Golden Legend the belief in scientific method and scientific law would have been impossible, for his mind was so filled with a different aspect of the world, which he would have thought that experience had verified for him, that there was no room in it for new truths; so many a man at the present day is so completely absorbed with all his intellectual powers in investigating the laws of nature that for him there is no room for anything else. But truth is not limited by the calibre of a man's brain; and just as science is true in spite of the disbelief of a mediaeval or modern hagiologist, so religion may be true even though the religious sense may be atrophied by a one-sided attention to the investigation of the natural causes of things.

And what is true of some individual man of science is equally true of the intellectual tendency of the day. It is sometimes said that this is a Positive Age. Our attention is directed often in what is clearly a disproportionate degree towards what is purely material. Our whole mind becomes absorbed in certain aspects of truth, and finds it difficult to care for, or grasp, or realize any other. So in the case of many people nowadays, their whole interest is devoted to the discoveries of science,

or the application of scientific knowledge to the amelioration of the conditions of human life, and they do not care for the more spiritual aspect of the world or for spiritual truths, which are not in the least inconsistent with their ruling conceptions. But this banishment of the spiritual does not depend upon, and is not justified by, any logical method. The excessive pursuit of pleasure deadens our minds to moral truths; but the moral truths are true all the same. A one-sided pursuit of science may deaden our minds to religious truths; but religion may still be true, still necessary for human life, and the investigation of its truths and principles just as important as it ever has been.

III

I do not propose to say much about the relation of theology to the various branches of mental and moral philosophy, both because in many directions there is little new—philosophy still gives the strongest arguments for religious belief and suggests the most real difficulties—and because metaphysics themselves, equally with theology, exist only on sufferance in the opinion of many thinkers. Philosophy at present, to one who is not a philosopher, seems to speak with rather an uncertain sound. If the older sensationalism has made way for idealism, idealism is giving way in many minds to some form of realism, while coincidently scientific methods are laying their hands on psychology, claiming to wrest it from metaphysics, and suggesting that here, too, science will solve the problems which have defeated the less exact methods of the past. It is only possible, therefore, to touch on two or three leading points.

A new, or apparently new, departure meets us in experimental psychology. Its value and capabilities it

is difficult at present to appraise. To the physician and to medical science it will, it seems to me, be of the greatest value in the future; to education it may be of service if it is combined with the saving common-sense so often absent from educational theorists. But no doubt its advocates claim more for it than this. I do not believe myself that it touches, or can touch, the fundamental problems of life. We have always known that when we worked our brain our feet had a tendency to become cold, and that any violent emotion had definite physical effects. If these physical results of mental action can be worked out quantitatively there will be a definite gain to science. We know, indeed, that mind influences body and body mind. We have always recognized that our intellectual equipment is dependent on a physical basis. But the problem of how the physical changes in brain-stuff are translated into the facts of mental consciousness is not any nearer solution than it was before, however accurately we may measure mental phenomena. The mechanism of the brain does not account for the intellectual life which uses it, any more than the mechanism of a motor-car accounts for the intelligence which directs it. Even if in a sense it is true that consciousness is the product of evolution, just as we know that it is evolved in each individual, the process of the acquirement does not explain the fact of existence. When God breathed first into man the breath of conscious life, as He breathes it still into each individual, it was as much His work if He accomplished it through the energy of Nature which is His energy, as it would have been had He to interfere with that energy. Consciousness is a fact, and a fact that requires metaphysics for its explanation; for the mystery is that that which, from one point of view, is part of the stream of existence, from

another point of view is something outside of that stream, combining, creating, unifying the very world of which it is a part.

It was the great service of Professor Green to idealist philosophy that he shewed, in a way which seemed to many of us conclusive, that the older sensationalism gained no real support from the fact of evolution, and that it still remains an inadequate explanation of the facts of mental and moral life. That idealist philosophy gives a perfectly adequate basis upon which a system of Christian theology may be built up, has generally, in spite of the efforts of Mr. Bradley, been recognized. It is not necessary for me to go over such well-known ground. A recent exposition of such a basis for belief has been made by Dr. Rashdall in *Contentio Veritatis*. It is a lucid statement of the principles of idealism, and an able defence of Christian theology. It is not indeed entirely convincing. For it fails from a certain element of dogmatism, and an almost excessive logical completeness which suggests a feeling of unreality. We wonder after all when we have read it whether this conception of the universe so unlike our ordinary ideas is really true.

For somehow many of those who used to be strong idealists are not so now. They are beginning, strange as it may seem, to drift into realism. To me the argument which seems to lead in that direction is something as follows: It is quite true that all I know of the external world is my consciousness of that world; but after all how does it come about that so many other minds share that consciousness, and express it just as I do, and that they can analyze it as I analyze it, and that they think of it as I think of it? Does not this multiplicity of *egos*, of the existence of which my *ego* gives me information, sharing the same impression of

something which they believe to be external, imply a reality in that outside world of which they have an impression? If I alone see a thing, I do not know anything about its reality. My glasses may be coloured. But have all men coloured glasses? So I begin to believe that the cause of my consciousness of what is external to me is that there is an external thing of which I have not indeed a perfect but an adequate knowledge. A realism of this sort is probably most in accordance with the spirit of the age; but realism is not materialism. We only arrive at a belief in the reality of the causes of our sensations by assuming the reality of our mind. And it is only if the mind be real that we can explain the existence of the science which would try and explain away mind. The analysis of consciousness which is at the basis of idealism remains true when idealism changes into realism, and to explain the facts of mind some hypothesis is required as much as to explain the existence of a rational universe. Just as when we were examining the facts of the universe we suggested that they might be explained by the hypothesis which theology supplies, so is it true of mind. We cannot prove the truths of theology in any way in which we can the truths of science, for science is an analysis of the experience of our senses, and religion deals with what is beyond the cognisance of our senses; but whether we look at the fact of a rational universe or of a mind which can have cognisance of that fact, or of the moral instincts of that mind, of all these facts the explanation given by theology is adequate. Philosophy asks certain questions and sets certain problems. Of these problems Theology gives us a solution. God, Nature, the human soul—the belief in these may still be the most rational solution of the problem of existence.

One more service philosophy renders to theology. While it quite rightly reminds us of the absence of strict logical proof of much that theology rightly puts forward as an adequate explanation, it at the same time reminds us also of the futility of much popular or semi-popular criticism. The truths or statements of theology must clearly often be beyond the real grasp of the human mind. That that is so is certainly no ground for not accepting them. The one thing certain, where so much is uncertain, is the limitation of the human mind. That we cannot understand a thing is clearly no reason why it should not be true. Our human intellect is limited by a very narrow experience. Before all that transcends that experience an attitude of reverent agnosticism, an agnosticism which may be the quite adequate basis of belief, is most in accordance with the limits of our intelligence, and our consciousness of the inadequacy of our mental equipment. Religion becomes a reality because we know how much there is which we cannot understand.

IV

So far we have examined the sources of what is commonly called Natural Theology. It has not of course been possible to do so with any completeness, but we have touched on those points on which discovery has been made, or where criticism has been at work. And our conclusion is that recent discovery or speculation has not in any real way altered the problem, and that the hypothesis of a theistic solution is still the one which will most adequately account for all the facts. But if there be a God, He would not have left Himself without witness, and we proceed to examine the different sources of Revealed Religion.

We may pass for our present purpose very lightly over the Revelation of God in the universal religious instinct of the human race. The study of comparative religion and its kindred sciences has been pursued with great ardour during recent years, and a large number of works have been written, many of them clearly having for their object, either to find what is described as a natural basis for religion, or to dethrone Christianity from its unique position, or to point out the analogies in other religions to the customs and ideas of Christianity. To discuss these questions would be beyond our scope: I would only suggest certain propositions which may sum up the attitude that I would adopt towards these studies.

It is quite true on one side that almost every custom or rite of Judaism or Christianity has its analogy in other religions, and may very probably have a similar source. This was better known to many of the Christian Fathers than it is to us. That did not however in their eyes, nor need it in ours, prove anything against the special revelation in Christianity, because it would be natural that God should speak to the Jews in the form and manner of existing religious thought, and that our Lord should instruct His followers in accordance with ideas actually existing among them, and not in an entirely new manner.

On the other hand the study of mankind bears witness to religion as something which satisfies certain needs. The advance of a race or nation implies also an advance in religion. Sometimes a nation as it developes itself developes a religion in accordance with its higher needs, sometimes what is higher comes from outside and itself is a factor in determining the elevation of the people. The Christian religion as revealed in Christ represents the goal towards which the aspirations of other nations

have tended, and an ideal to which they must ultimately desire to conform. In no way, therefore, is it necessary for us, any more than it was for Fathers like Justin or Clement, to doubt that in a sense there has been in all nations some revelation of God, shewn in the gradual developement of higher purpose, of purer ideals and continued moral progress. But nothing in them as a matter of fact takes away from the uniqueness of Christianity. In so far as other religions have been by various investigators brought into competition with it, it has been by interpreting them from a Christian point of view and reading into their phraseology Christian ideas.

With these few words of preface we pass on to the special Christian revelation as it is presented to us in the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the authority of the Christian Church.

There are many nowadays who would be inclined to give up the Old Testament. There are undoubtedly many who feel that, to say the least, such an atmosphere of uncertainty has surrounded the Old Testament owing to the results of critical studies, that it is quite unsafe to build anything upon it. Such an attitude is, I believe, quite unnecessary. It is possible to accept most of the results, even the most adverse results of Old Testament criticism, and not lose in any way its abiding value. The history will be different, the form of revelation will be different, but the value of the theological and moral truths will remain unimpaired. My own belief is indeed that, although many important results of criticism are proved, so far as anything in such subject-matter is capable of proof, yet a great deal is, to say the least, precarious, and some of the newest developements are barely coherent or even sane. But what I wish to emphasize is that the right position is

one which allows perfectly free play to every form of critical ingenuity or to all the strange vagaries of archaeological apologetics, and at the same time does not give up any of the permanent religious teaching or of the authority on which it is based.

What is the authority of the Old Testament? It sometimes seems almost forgotten amid the storm of controversy that, whatever may be the actual date of the various books of the Old Testament, it is quite certain that all or nearly all of them had been written many hundreds of years before the New Testament. They had become canonical, they had been translated into another language, and their meaning had become fixed long before Christianity began. This is after all quite certain, and equally certain are two or three broad propositions which may be deduced from it.

In the first place, the Old Testament taught in a manner quite unique the belief in one God. It may be that it was only by slow degrees that the people of Israel learnt this: that polytheism made way for henotheism and through henotheism was learnt Monotheism. In whatever way it was learnt, and whatever traces there may be in the Bible of less perfect forms of religion and of less adequate conceptions of the Deity having prevailed, in any case Monotheism, a high and elevated Monotheism, is the religion of the Old Testament, and of the Old Testament alone in the ancient world. Again, the Old Testament combines in a manner which was quite unique religion and morality. The one God whom Israel learnt to worship was a God exalted in righteousness. Here also it is quite true that we can trace progress. It was only gradually that Israel learnt the lesson, and when this is pointed out we can see quite clearly older strata in the Bible which represent the inadequate conceptions out of which the

religion of Israel developed. But in any case righteousness, purity and holiness are the notes of the Old Testament religion in marked contrast to the beliefs of surrounding nations.

It was a firm conviction among the Jews that they were in a particular way God's chosen people, and that they had been selected from among the nations, that in them all the families of the earth might be blessed. Whether or no these words were spoken to Abraham, or whether a prophet of the period of the Monarchy chose the story in which they are contained as the most suitable vehicle for expressing a truth which he felt himself permitted to teach, in any case the belief in this Divine selection and commission was firmly ingrained in Judaism, and had been so for generations before the birth of Christ. And this special blessing for and through Israel was associated with the expectation of the Messiah. It may be, it probably is, true that many passages supposed to have a Messianic meaning were originally understood to bear a quite different interpretation; it may again be true that the idea grew slowly and from vague beginnings; but it is quite certain that the Old Testament looked forward to the advent of one, to whom the name Messiah came to be given, and it is equally certain that this belief was very strongly held among the Jews long before the Christ came.

And all these hopes and expectations and prophecies were fulfilled in quite an unexpected and unique manner in Christ. It may be that they helped their own fulfilment. This they were probably intended to do. But it does not take away from the wonderful character of the event. It may be again that the fulfilment was different in many ways from the expectation. It succeeded in a wonderful manner in separating what

was of mere temporary validity from what was of permanent value, but that does not detract from the wonder of the sequel. The preparation in the history of the Jews for the coming of Christ in all its manifold variety, and the pure and lofty conception of religion which it puts before us, place the stamp of authority on the Old Testament.

I feel, then, that whatever may be the result or developement of Old Testament criticism, we are amply justified in accepting its authority as a revelation of religious truth to mankind. But if we accept it, in what way can we use it? Here it seems to me that historical criticism has done a work of very great value. The old unhistorical method, according to which the Old Testament, equally with the New Testament, was looked upon as providing a number of texts which might be used without reference to their context, and without reference to their historical meaning, often even without reference to their grammatical interpretation, in order to support or bolster up a system of doctrine, is clearly and definitely condemned. But at the same time the professor of dogmatic theology is not particularly concerned with Jewish history, nor with the historical steps by which the Old Testament theology was evolved, nor with the various strata in the books of the Law. It is his business rather to reconstruct the Old Testament theology as it is represented in the Bible as a whole, as it might be believed and interpreted by the Jews before the coming of our Lord, as it is presupposed throughout the Gospels. To do so in detail might be difficult, to distinguish the varying beliefs of the different sects of the Jews might be tedious; but the broad facts of Old Testament teaching, the unity of the Godhead, the supremacy of the moral law, the sacrificial system, with its implied lessons of the holiness

of God, of the sin of man and of the need of atonement, the personal religion of the Psalms, the zeal for righteousness of the Prophets, the orderly ideal of family life depicted in the Wisdom literature—all these, representing as they do the foundations on which our Christian belief was built up, remain untouched by any criticism: they come to us with an authority which is unimpaired and a value which is undiminished. The limitations of the Old Testament we may learn by the fulfilment in Christ, but its positive value has not been taken away by a criticism which only touches the account of its origin, and the obligation of mankind to its teaching will always remain.

V

As we progress our work becomes in some ways more difficult, and the issues raised more important and more controverted. We may take many along with us in believing that Nature even with the most rigid scientific interpretation witnesses to something transcendental, that the ultimate lesson of metaphysics is the reality of soul and duty, that the Old Testament is a revelation (whatever revelation may mean) of a sublime Monotheism; but when we reach the New Testament we must come to a parting of the ways, for we have to decide whether for us the revelation in Christ is an unique revelation of what is true or only a stage in human evolution.

There is, indeed, an intermediate position associated with the well-known name of Ritschl in Germany, which would have us believe that, although substantially the historical facts on which Christianity is based cannot be accepted, yet their theological value remains unimpaired. They have the value which attaches to

what is known to be practically beneficial; they are in fact "value judgements," that is, propositions which whether true or not are wholesome, and we must add will have authority only for those who are willing to accept them as true, for they have no external sanction.

I do not believe that this is a position in which people can rest, for the strength and power of Christianity have always depended on the conviction that certain events really did happen. Thus a solid historical foundation was given for truths which otherwise are apart from and unproveable by human experience, and are, therefore, very hard to believe; for although they may appeal to our higher nature they are repugnant to our lower, and need to come to us supported by some testimony outside themselves in order to gain any universal acceptance. In a sense a man can feel the truths of Christianity as being the embodiment of the highest ideals of our nature, but it is only when he has been educated as a Christian and has formed his judgement in a Christian atmosphere. The Cross was to the Greeks foolishness, and some people nowadays are beginning to re-echo that sentiment in theory, as they have adhered to it in their practice. I am bound then, as I believe, to shew in what sense and how far we can find authority [1] outside itself for

[1] A few words of explanation are perhaps necessary here. There is no word that puzzles and frightens a certain number of persons so much as "authority." When Mr. Balfour introduced it into his work on the *Foundations of Belief*, his critics were up in arms and began to scent ecclesiasticism. As a matter of fact he was quite right in recognizing that all beliefs, whether of science, of morals, or of faith, must rest ultimately on some authority. In the following pages "authority" is always used, not of what is antagonistic to reason, but of what commends itself to reason. Scientific beliefs have authority in so far as we are satisfied with the processes by which they are attained. So with regard to religion, we look to see from what source we attain our knowledge of Divine things, and what is the authority

the Christian revelation as the source of Christian doctrine.

In the first place, we need have no reasonable doubts about the dates, and to a very large extent about the authorship, of the Books of the New Testament. That I hold, speaking generally, as the clear result of scientific investigation. The Epistles of S. Paul, or almost all of them, are what they profess to be; the Synoptic Gospels give the story of our Lord's teaching as it comes to us from the first generation of Christian teachers; the Johannine books were written at least within a hundred years of our Lord's death. All these are facts which I consider certain, and they by themselves will be enough for our purpose. I need not now go into more disputed or doubtful points.

But here to many minds there is a great difficulty. Historical truth is, they tell us, so uncertain that nothing can be allowed to rest upon it. This is a difficulty which we inherit from the eighteenth century. It is put in its most extreme form in some words of Lessing, which I quote from Professor Harnack: "Historical truth which is accidental in its character, can never become the proof of the truths of reason, which are necessary." Put in this form,

on which we believe them. That authority is for most Christians—Protestant or Catholic—the living voice of their Church; from this they receive a system of doctrine and life and the Bible, which contains the credentials of their Church. So long as doubt, or inquiry, or comparison are absent; so long as the teaching they have accepted corresponds to their spiritual and intellectual nature, they do not doubt the authority. But a time for inquiry may come. It is the purpose of this lecture to sketch the lines of such an inquiry, and to suggest the rational grounds on which and the limits within which we may accept the authority of Scripture, Tradition, and the Church as giving us knowledge of Divine things. Only let it be clearly understood that there can be no authority which does not commend itself to our reason and work in us through our reason.

it could not appeal to us at the present day, for it is associated with a metaphysic which we should hardly be able to accept; but the feeling which it represents is still very strong. To many minds there is something uncertain, almost unreal, about events which are past and gone, and they feel that it is hardly possible to prove anything by them. The fault is perhaps partly one of imagination. A very good modern illustration of this type of scepticism is given by Professor Percy Gardner's books. To him historical truth is in any real sense unattainable, and he would support his theology on a psychological as opposed to an historical basis. Of history, he writes as follows:

"First, then, of historic criticism. This is a destructive force, and a force of immense power. It is liable to become historic scepticism, and if exercised unduly may reduce the fabric of history, at all events of ancient history, to a heap of ruins. For the fabric of history is not adapted to sustain the assault of methods which are reasonable when applied to things physical and visible. We cannot cross-question historic characters as we could question witnesses in a law court. Thus a direct attack on any supposed fact, if forced home, can seldom be met."[1]

This general statement is then illustrated by a particular instance:

"It is, however, quite obvious that even in regard to outward and visible events we shall comparatively seldom be able to arrive at perfect certainty. Take an event of the present century witnessed by thousands, of whom a few were lately alive, the battle of Waterloo. Of that event there are a multitude of quite inconsistent accounts in existence, between which it is difficult or impossible to make choice. How, then, can we hope to

[1] *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 127. By Percy Gardner. London, 1899.

reach objective truth in regard to events further from us?"[1]

I have quoted this second passage because the deductions that I should make from it are the exact opposite to those which Professor Gardner makes. It shews to my mind how unimportant to the truth of history are the minor difficulties to which such importance is here attached. We know that there are many different stories of events which happened at Waterloo, and some of them are quite inconsistent with one another. On many minor points there are curious discrepancies in the evidence. But in spite of that we are certain about every fact of real importance. That the battle was fought, that the French army was defeated, that great political changes were the result, all these are as certain as any fact or law of science. They are certain because we have not only the evidence as to what actually did happen, but we have also the corroborative testimony of all history before and after. Even if by any curious accident every direct historical reference to the battle of Waterloo were eliminated from our authorities, we should still be able to prove that some such event had happened by the testimony of previous and subsequent history. The discrepancies in the narratives are as unimportant as the individual errors of scientific observers.

Now exactly the same argument will be true of the foundation of Christianity. Something similar to the events recorded in the Gospels must have happened. You cannot explain subsequent history unless they did. Take one fact. How otherwise can you explain the new meaning and significance attached to the word "Cross"? It is only explicable on the hypothesis that

[1] *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 128.

our Lord died (as is recorded) on the Cross, and that in some way or other His disciples learnt of the victory of the Cross. And the same method of argument that applies to the life of Christ as a whole I would apply to the crucial fact of the Resurrection. It is quite true that there are difficulties in harmonizing the various narratives, as there are difficulties in knowing exactly what happened at Waterloo. It is extremely improbable that the accounts of such an event would be any more clear and coherent than are the accounts of the details of a battle. People might be quite certain that they had had an unique experience which had influenced their whole spiritual life, yet just because of its extraordinary character discrepancies would arise in the exact accounts of the experiences. And the evidence for the Resurrection and the other transcendental events which are associated with it lies, not only in the actual narrative, not only in certain corroborative details, as the empty grave, but in the subsequent history of those who had seen the risen Lord. We know what the Apostles were, we know how the betrayal and crucifixion influenced them, we know what they became. The cause of the transformation lies just in those passages and events recorded in the New Testament records, which thus fit harmoniously and naturally into their places.

And in exactly the same way the Gospel narrative and revelation in all its completeness fits into its proper place in universal history. We know that in some way or other a tremendous change was wrought. It is very commonly stated nowadays that the Christ of the Gospels was the creation of the Christian Church. The difficulty that such a statement leaves is that some adequate cause is necessary to explain the creation of that Church. We may put it in another way. In S. Paul's

Epistles we have a clear picture of the teaching and position of the Church when they were written, a picture not only of what S. Paul taught, but also of what he shared with his contemporaries. We have to find an adequate cause for the growth in a period of about thirty years of all this body of life and doctrine.

On critical grounds, then, I do not feel that there is any call to substitute for the traditional story a new theory which would compel us to reconstruct out of our own imaginations a new Christ. I am prepared to accept the New Testament as the record of an unique Revelation, and to use it as an authoritative source of religious truth. But as to the manner in which it should be used a very considerable change has slowly been effected.

It would take us too long to work out in detail the history and growth of the historical method of interpretation. It has even yet been very little grasped by most people, and the habit still widely prevails of using the Bible—Old and New Testament alike—just as it suits a man's purpose. According to the old method, the Bible represents a theological code or text, the words of which may be quoted and applied without any regard to the contents of the passage. In opposition to this there is a very definite historical method of using it in which we have been practised in our classical studies. Before we develope the permanent value of anything that is said, we try to reconstruct for ourselves the exact meaning of the writer from his own point of view and in accordance with the thought of the times. When that is done, when we know what was the meaning of the words of Christ as recorded in the different Gospels, what was the interpretation of them given by the different Apostles, and have worked out the origin and history of our religious

beliefs, then, but not till then, are we in a position to ask what is the dogmatic system of Christianity.

The method is longer than the older way of dealing with the Bible; it is also more interesting. It will not, I believe, change or alter our conception of the Christian Creed, but on a large number of subordinate points, just those points on which Christians have been divided, it will probably be necessary for us to give up favourite texts and favourite misinterpretations of texts, and it will be found that the New Testament often affords no solid ground for any decision on many debated points. The various systems of partisan Christianity which have been built upon isolated texts, on passages wrongly interpreted, on the misuse of the Old and New Testament alike, will gradually be found to be untenable. On the other hand, a great deal of harm has been done in recent years by the manner in which crude critical theories have been seized upon and made use of in partisan interests by persons who are quite unacquainted with the grounds for them. Our greatest hope for the future lies in the gradual growth and spread of a sober, wise, historical criticism which may both in its method and temper check and retard sectarian partisanship.

VI

But it is impossible to limit our authority for Christianity to the Bible and the New Testament. Christianity is what it has become, and even if we would we cannot cut ourselves adrift from the Christian Past. At the time of the Reformation the attempt was made to appeal to the Bible and the Bible only as the religion of Protestants. The only result was to build up a number of inconsistent Protestant systems

the whole scope and contents of which were determined by mediaeval theology. Our beliefs are always conditioned by inherited teaching, even if we revolt from it.

The authority of the Christian Church is claimed in two directions—Christian tradition, and the theology of the Catholic Church.

The controversy between the authority of Christian tradition and that of Scripture is one which is exceedingly unprofitable, for the antithesis is a false one. The Scriptures are simply a part of the Church tradition. But there is a real question of great importance, and that is, what Church traditions have we of a reliable character outside? I remember a conversation which I once had with a Russian monk in which he discussed the imperfections of the English Church. S. Paul, he said, tells you that even if an angel from heaven should bid you change any of those things which I have delivered to you, you should not do so. "You have changed many things; we, we have changed nothing from the beginning." That is the claim put in its most extreme form. Now undoubtedly there was in the Church for many centuries an uninterrupted tradition of church life, and a Christian in the fourth century would have believed that the existing ecclesiastical system was based upon apostolic custom. Can that claim be made good? The answer must be in any sense in which he would have intended it, No. We can, as a matter of fact, trace historically the developement of most of the elements of that system. There is quite a distinct difference in considerable detail between the church systems of the second and fourth centuries, a difference sufficient to justify us in assuming that the existence of a custom in the fourth century is no proof of its apostolic origin.

But while the appeal to tradition is not true in this exact sense, in another it is a fact of very great importance.

Neither our ecclesiastical system nor our theological beliefs are ultimately derived from the Bible. For nearly thirty years Christianity was preached and the Christian Church was in existence before any books of the New Testament were written; it was another twenty or thirty years before they came into at all general use; it was sixty or seventy years before they became authoritative, and at least one hundred years before there was a definite Canon of Scripture. During these years the Christian belief and practice was based on, and developed, the apostolic teaching. We know that in its substantial form it was the same as that which we accept to-day, because it has its reflection in the different apostolic writings; but Christianity was not derived from them, nor the Church system, nor the proportion and form of Christian doctrine. While then it is not safe to accept anything as certainly true which is not witnessed to by Scripture, because a tradition, if living, is always changing, on the other hand the Church tradition is an independent witness to the apostolic teaching, and it is the tradition which gives us the true proportion of apostolic teaching and practice. The Epistle to the Romans, for example, is not engaged in a discussion concerning the Christian Faith; it presupposes in its readers the possession of it, and discusses certain great questions which arise from it. When the Reformation theologians, then, attempted to construct their theories on the basis of this Epistle, it was not that their expositions were erroneous so much as that they distorted the proportions of the Christian Faith; they exalted subordinate questions into primary. So also to me the whole of

modern German theology has suffered because it has taken as its starting point the teaching of Luther, rather than the teaching of Christ as represented by the Apostles.

May I give an illustration of what I mean from a question which is very much before us at the present day? The belief in the Virgin-birth is part of the Christian creed, and as we may judge from the testimony of Ignatius was part of that creed in his day. Now, there is no reason to think that it found its way there from the Gospels, in which the narratives of the event are recorded; but the Christian tradition, like the narratives in the Gospels, bears witness to something earlier than either. It is quite clear that neither of the Gospel narratives was derived from the other, and therefore they give independent witness to a prevailing belief which is also witnessed to by the Church tradition.

The Christian tradition, then, is a guide of absolute importance in interpreting the Christian revelation, and this revelation has been transformed into a theology by the Christian Church.

It is a great advantage or disadvantage, as you will, that we should have had in one of the most important theological works of the present day the very elaborate indictment of the whole developement of Christianity given us by Professor Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*. The object of that work is quite clearly to undermine the authority of the traditional dogmatic theology. To judge from many comments on it which I have read, it is apparent that a great deal of it which was a commonplace to the theologian has come as something quite fresh to many readers, and has received an undue amount of attention. It is quite true that our formulated theology is the result of the Greek intellect,

assisted by Greek philosophy, working on the Hebrew revelation. It is quite true that all down the Christian ages there has been a developement of the meaning of the Christian message, and that human speculation is mingled with the exact words of the New Testament. But surely this crude condemnation of what is Hellenic is quite unjustified, whether from a Christian or a philosophical point of view. The Christian remembers the words in S. John's Gospel, "He will guide you into all truth." He believes that it is a far grander conception to hold that all the wealth of the human intellect and all the product of the highest human thought have been employed in interpreting and explaining the truth once for all delivered to the Saints, and he would accept the authority of the Church of the early centuries as of the Church of the Middle Ages and of more modern times. It is quite true that we demand something absolutely simple as sufficient for our salvation, but the Christian creed has always been simple, and does not claim as necessary for salvation anything which is not implied in the frank acceptance of Christ as the Son of God. But, although the fundamental Christian belief is simple, no mind is satisfied without explanation and definition, and the work and thought of the Christian Church is part of the Christian heritage. The criticisms of Professor Harnack are often unjust and shallow, and it seems a strange service to employ all the knowledge and intellect of the nineteenth century to try to eliminate the intellectual elements from Christianity.

The doctrine of the Trinity is clearly in a sense a developement. The teaching of Augustine on that doctrine is still further a developement, but the whole Christian conception of God is brought out in tremendous fulness when he sums up the doctrine of the Trinity in the revelation of Love. His basis is the revelation of

Christ. This had been interpreted by three centuries of Christian thought, by all the subtlety of the Hellenic mind, and the power of the Greek language. He inherits the fruits of heathen philosophy; his mind is enriched with the most profound spiritual experience, and he puts before us the most sublime conceptions of the Godhead which the human mind has ever been able to conceive.

The authoritative decrees of the Church formulated, in language which has not been and is not likely to be improved upon, the fundamental belief in Christ's message. The teaching of the Church has presented in every age the meaning of this message, interpreting it as it could in the language of the day. The student of the history of dogmatic theology inherits all the teaching of the past. He must distinguish what is temporary and accidental and imperfect and incomplete from what has been taken up by the conscience of the Church as a whole. He realizes how each age has its faults, and each age has corrected the faults of other days. He is like a wise steward giving out of his treasure things new and old. Guided by the teaching of the past, weighing well all that has come down to him, he will attempt to interpret for his own age the Christian revelation which is true for all ages.

VII

The sources of our theology, then, are the continuous revelation of the Old Testament as accepted in the New, the revelation of Christ in the New Testament, the witness of Christian tradition, and the living voice of the Christian Church. I do not believe that the results of recent discovery will be found to impair its authority, but the method of the theologian will be to a certain extent changed by critical and historical research. Using

these methods, it is his business to teach the contents of the Christian revelation as answering the needs and corresponding to the aspirations of the present day as of past days.

But I suppose that to many persons doubts will arise as to the value of all this. There have been periods in our history when the discussion and study of dogmatic questions has been the most serious and absorbing intellectual interest of the age ; at the present day the interest has largely gone. Even many of those who are religious would be satisfied with a somewhat vague and half-expressed religious feeling. No doubt an untrue or disproportioned theology has done harm, but that only makes a wise theology more important. I would ask, then, is it not true that a right hold of the spiritual realities of life is the one absolutely important thing for a nation, and that the character and future of a nation will largely depend upon the reality and truth of its spiritual life? There are trivialities in theology as in science. Theology, like philosophy, may have degenerated into word-splitting. But theology deals with the most tremendous issues and with beliefs which have transformed human nature. And the judgement of history would be on our side. How much both of the greatness and the limitations of the Scottish character are due to their theological training? What does not America owe to the moral strength of the Puritan settlers in New England? I believe that a great deal of our English national character has been due to the fact that a large portion of the nation has been trained on the two great facts of "faith" and "duty." And I believe that if, in obedience to the intolerance of secularism, the nation gives up that basis for a meaningless and invertebrate unsectarianism, it will be an infinitely greater disaster than an unsuccessful war or

an unwise fiscal policy. For it touches the very nerve of national life.

A nation's greatness depends upon its character, its character largely depends upon its religious beliefs, and all onesidedness and error in its beliefs are reflected in its life. The office and work of any one who is called on to teach dogmatic theology is as important as ever it was, and to restate the great truths which are always the same, yet always changing in their aspect, is, however little it may be realized, one of the most grand and most important of duties, and all the more so just when it harmonizes little with the thoughts and aims of the age.

III

THE NEW THEOLOGY[1]

EVERY thoughtful person will recognize that, while the Christian Creed is always the same, Christian theology is always changing. This is right and natural. The Christian Creed enshrines a Divine revelation. It tells us of knowledge given to man of that which transcends experience, and it is held to-day, as it always has been, with an unanimity that is remarkable. It is the fashion to be dwelling continually on the divisions of Christians and the differences of opinion which prevail. Those who do so seem to forget that substantially upon the great subject of the contents of the Creed all existing bodies of Christians are at one. All alike—Roman, Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant, so long as they claim to be orthodox—can express their belief in the terms of the Creed promulgated at Chalcedon. But while the Christian belief is and always has been one, Christian theology is infinitely varied, because it is the interpretation of that belief in human language, in the language adapted to each age and country. The thought of Athanasius was very different from that of Augustine.

[1] *The New Theology*. By R. J. Campbell, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. Fifth Impression. (London: Chapman & Hall, Limited, 1907.) This review appeared first in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1907, Vol. lxiv., No. 128.

East and West think very differently. The man brought up on the scholastic philosophy cannot express his ideas in the same way as the pupil of Darwin. To each the Creed must be interpreted in a way that he can understand. More than that, each will have something to give to the comprehension of the Christian faith. We know more of what Christianity means each time a new system of philosophy comes to assist in interpreting it.

When, then, we are told of a "New Theology," although our remembrance of the humble spirit of the greatest theologians will make us resent the title, we do not consider it necessary to condemn it beforehand. If theology were not always becoming new the Christian Church would be failing in its work. We recognize that in the face of the problems of the present day old truths require restatement. Science, evolution, psychology, Biblical criticism, all raise questions which demand an answer. Nor, again, are we especially enamoured of a great deal of the theology of the Reformation. We certainly hold no brief for the particular religious opinions against which Mr. Campbell's teaching is a protest; hence we do not approach the examination of his new doctrines with any feeling of prejudice. That any one should revolt against a great deal of the traditional teaching of the City Temple seems to us an entirely healthy sign. We are therefore anxious to consider what he has to say, certainly without prejudice, and perhaps with some feelings of sympathy. But we are afraid that the result of our reading has been to change our sympathy into protest. We have seldom read a theological work that professed to be part of a revolution of religious thought which has been to us more repellent. We do not quarrel with Mr. Campbell so much because he has the tricks of the popular

preacher, because he is strangely ignorant both of theology and philosophy—a state of mind which is not uncommon among those who profess to be leaders of thought. That he despises what he does not know is equally natural. We might pardon all these things, but we cannot pardon—and we say it with the utmost seriousness—the irreverent parodies of popular religious thought that disfigure the work. They are as futile from the point of view of argument as they are unworthy of serious theology. It is quite easy to make any form of opinion appear to look ridiculous by stating it in a ridiculous way. It shocks every reverent mind, and it does not help the cause of truth. So strongly do we feel this that we should in many ways have been inclined to pass the book over in complete silence, but it is clear that the difficulties which have caused Mr. Campbell to build up what seems to us so inadequate a theology are felt probably in just the same crude form by many other persons, and we think that it may be useful to try not so much to criticize Mr. Campbell—for that has, we think, been done sufficiently—as to attempt to unravel these difficulties. We shall therefore banish as much as possible from our minds the defects of the work, and address ourselves to the different questions which Mr. Campbell raises.

I

The main purpose of *The New Theology* is described in the following words:

"What is wanted is a restatement of the essential truth of the Christian religion in terms of the modern mind. Where or when the name New Theology arose I do not know, but it has been in existence for at least one generation. . . . It has long been in use . . . to

indicate the attitude of those who believe that the fundamentals of the Christian faith need to be rearticulated in terms of the immanence of God."

Certain intellectual difficulties have, in the opinion of Mr. Campbell, made this necessary. He is defining the meaning of God, and he writes as follows:

"So far science has only succeeded in giving us a vaster, grander conception of God, by giving us a vaster, grander conception of the universe in which we live. When I say God, I mean the mysterious Power which is finding expression in the universe, and which is present in every tiniest atom of the wondrous whole. I find that this Power is the one reality I cannot get away from, for, whatever else it may be, it is myself. Theologians will tell me that I have taken a prodigious leap in saying this; but I cannot help it. How can there be anything in the universe outside of God? Whatever distinctions of being there may be within the universe, it is surely clear that they must all be transcended and comprehended within infinity. There cannot be two infinities, nor can there be an infinite and also a finite beyond it. What infinity may be we have no means of knowing. Here the most devout Christian is just as much of an agnostic as Professor Huxley; we can predicate nothing with confidence concerning the all-comprehending unity wherein we live and move and have our being, save and except as we see it manifested in that part of our universe which lies open to us. One would think that this were so obvious as to need no demonstration. But how do ordinary church-going Christians talk about God? They talk as though He were (practically) a finite being, stationed somewhere above and beyond the universe, watching and worrying over other and lesser finite beings—to wit, ourselves. According to the received phraseology, this God is greatly bothered and thwarted by what men have been doing throughout the few millenniums of human existence. He takes the whole thing very seriously, and

thinks about little else than getting wayward humanity into line again. To this end He has adopted various expedients, the chief of which was the sending of His only-begotten Son to suffer and die in order that He might be free to forgive the trouble we had caused Him."

We have quoted this passage because it is thoroughly characteristic both of the style and of the confusion of thought of the writer. It is interesting to find ourselves back again in the old difficulties of the Gnostic. How can the Infinite become finite? How can God, who is all, create anything? These are the questions which perplexed so many dreamers in the second century, and produced those wonderful systems of speculative Gnosticism which have much in common with Mr. Campbell's theology—systems which were really attempts, just as his is, to express Christianity in the terms of Divine immanence. But Mr. Campbell and the Gnostics alike have fallen into the fashion of arguing from words as if they understood what they meant. He says quite rightly that we have no means of knowing what infinity is. If that be the case how can we argue about what the Infinite God can or cannot do? That is the whole root of the difficulty. Every mathematician knows that if you introduce infinity into a problem you can arrive at very strange results. So it is in language. We call God Infinite[1] because we have no other way of expressing what we mean, but the word is purely negative. We can only think of infinity as being unlimited, and it is just as hard for us to think of the unlimited as it is to think of the limited. As has been well put, the infinite is only a

[1] It may be noticed that the Anglican Articles (in which the language is carefully chosen) do not speak of God as "infinite," but as "of infinite power, wisdom and goodness"—which is a very different thing.

concept of the mind. Mr. Campbell, like many other thinkers, has argued about it as if it represented a reality. When we deny the possibility of God having created the universe because we cannot understand how the Infinite became finite, we are simply limiting the Divine power by our own mental conceptions. It would be more correct to say not that God is unlimited, but that He is self-limited. The whole question is discussed, we think, very well by Dr. Strong.

"The question of infinity is more serious. It seems to involve a real limitation upon the infinity of God, that He should fix definite laws for created existence and allow a thought to take shape, as it were, outside Himself in an independent fashion. . . .

"It is true, that if the desire arose from without, and was caused, as in the case of men, by some change occurring independently of the subject of it, such a position would be in contradiction with the idea of Infinity. But it is quite different if the desire depends solely upon the will of the Infinite, and if the realization of it, even though it may involve limitation, is self-chosen. It is quite possible that Creation may mean in some sense a self-limitation on the part of God, though we cannot fully understand in what sense. But it will be remembered that in the last chapter we quoted an ancient doctrine mentioned by S. Irenæus, that the nature of God is self-limiting; the Father, writes S. Irenæus, is unmeasured, the Son is the measure of the Father. And we cannot but think that this thought is far truer, we believe, and more suitable to the notion of God than the popular epithet infinite. This word is purely negative in its associations; it means literally nothing but the absence of all limits. And there is nothing in it to show that it does not include the absence of all positive existence. . . .

"What we desire to affirm is, that neither finite nor infinite has any proper meaning apart from the idea of quantity, and that this is out of place in speaking

of personal life. On the other hand, the idea of self-limitation has none of the disadvantages of these two terms, finite and infinite. It is applicable to a personal being, and all the meaning it has is permeated through and through with the notion of personality. It may be employed with reference to any act in which a personal being decisively expresses himself, and it wholly avoids the contradiction between definite action and the so-called infinity of the Divine Being. It is exactly the expression best suited for describing action, and in the present application of it, it shows us Creation as in harmony with the revealed nature of God." [1]

Mr. Campbell's difficulties, then, like those of many others, have come, we believe, from his first saying that God is Infinite, a word which has no real relation to things and only expresses the limitation of our intellect, and then limiting His power by the epithet he has given Him. Surely it is wiser to keep the old term "Almighty." To deny that God can create new things is to limit His power. Grant Him to be Almighty, All-powerful, and this limitation is obviously a contradiction.

But Mr. Campbell differs from the Christian conception in another and a deeper way. His conception of God is not the Christian conception: it is a Greek conception, a philosophic conception; it is one which gives another name to the "unconscious force" of the materialist; but the very essence of the Christian conception is that God is personal. Its root is the Hebrew conception of "Jehovah, exalted in righteousness." The Christian believes in a personal and moral God, not an unmoral force. That all such language is of course difficult, that it is inadequate, we recognize; that the term personal can only be explained by human analogy and represents but a part of the truth, this we admit.

[1] *A Manual of Theology*, by T. B. Strong, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Second edition, pp. 192–194 (A. & C. Black, 1903).

But the essence of the whole Christian revelation as regards the nature of the Godhead begins with the belief that God is our Father. This, according to Professor Harnack, was the great truth which our Lord came to reveal to us, this is the dogma behind the simplest prayer of the little child, without this thought religion has no meaning. And it is just because, in the words which we have quoted, Mr. Campbell implicitly denies the Fatherhood of God that the whole of his superstructure is valueless. It is because, as Christ has revealed to us, God does care for a man and "*is bothered*" about man (if we may repeat these very irreverent words) that we pray to Him, that we worship Him, that we love Him. What does our Lord say?

"Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?"

"Why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?"

"Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows."

II

We pass on to ask what is the relation of man to God? And here we find Mr. Campbell somewhat frightened of pursuing the course upon which he has

started to its logical conclusion. We do not blame him for this: we think that if he had done so his theology and philosophy would be worse than it is; but our difficulty is that he seems to try to get all the credit of being a consistent Monist and yet to deny the accusation. This is what he writes:

"The ultimate Self of the universe is God. The New Testament speaks of man as body, soul, and spirit. The body is the thought-form through which the individuality finds expression on our present limited plane; the soul is a man's consciousness of himself as apart from all the rest of existence, and even from God—it is the bay seeing itself as the bay, and not as the ocean; the spirit is the true being thus limited and expressed—it is the deathless Divine within us. The soul, therefore, is what we make it; the spirit we can neither make nor mar, for it is at once our being and God's. What we are here to do is to grow the soul—that is, to manifest the true nature of the spirit, to build up that self-realization which is God's objective with the universe as a whole, and with every self-conscious unit in particular.

"Where, then, some one will say, is the dividing line between our being and God's? There is no dividing line except from our side. . . . But, the reader may protest, this is Pantheism. No, it is not. 'Pantheism' is a technical term in philosophic parlance, and means something quite different from this. It stands for a Fate-God, a God imprisoned in His universe, a God who cannot help Himself, and does not even know what He is about, a blind force which here breaks out into a rock and there into Ruskin, and is equally indifferent to either. But that is not my God. My God is my deeper Self, and yours too; He is the Self of the universe, and knows all about it. He is never baffled, and cannot be baffled; the whole cosmic process is one long incarnation and uprising of the being of God from itself to itself. With Tennyson you can call this doctrine the Higher Pantheism, if you like; but it is the

very antithesis of the Pantheism which has played such a part in the history of thought."

Now we quite admit that Mr. Campbell does not wish to teach Pantheism ; our difficulty is that we do not know how, starting with the premises that he does, he can save himself from such a conclusion. If we are God, God realizing Himself, and if everything good and evil is God, because there cannot be anything outside God, and if God is the force and power of the universe and is only expressed in the universe, and if we are also a part of the universe—and all this Mr. Campbell, so far as we can see, asserts—those who have logically gone further and taught Pantheism in its complete form seem to us to be consistent thinkers, while Mr. Campbell is not. Throughout he tells us that he wishes to shew that Christianity is really moral, and not immoral as the old theology would make out ; but he has in reality taken away the whole possibility of morality as it is commonly understood. He goes on to admit his want of logical consistency, for he says that you cannot defend free will logically, and yet somehow he feels that there must be room for something that would be free will. This shews that his logical conclusion is unsound ; does it not suggest to him that his premises are insufficient?

Let us try and state the lines on which we believe that the solution should be attained. Science, law, Pantheism, whatever you will, are simply the interpretation of part of our experience, our experience of the external world ; but we have another experience, far more real, far more true even than our knowledge of the external world—viz. our knowledge of ourself as a cause. The whole of human life and human thought, of society, of legislation, is based upon the idea that the

individual is a free cause. There are two elements in the experience of every man, and no philosophy is adequate which does not recognize both. Our experience is double: the experience of our own consciousness, the *Ego*, and the experience of that outside our consciousness, the world. Any system which is true to life and provides a basis of life must be true to both those experiences. Christianity puts before us three great entities—the world, myself, and, as the explanation of both, God. It assumes the reality of each of them; it gives a reasonable hypothesis for both my life and my experience. It makes me a moral being, and therefore it forms a reasonable basis of conduct. Mr. Campbell's philosophy in which ultimate distinctions have disappeared, whether we call it Pantheism or, as he prefers it, a Monistic idealism, does not. He wishes, as we shall see, to establish a sound basis of moral action, but we fail ourselves to find it in his teaching.

III

There is no part of Mr. Campbell's theory which has laid itself open to more criticism than his treatment of the problem of sin. Some of the criticism may not be quite fair to Mr. Campbell's own opinions, as passages have been quoted apart from their context. But if we save his character as a preacher, we can hardly preserve it as a philosopher. It will be most convenient to quote different views which he expresses.

"Evil is a negative, not a positive term. It denotes the absence rather than the presence of something. It is the perceived privation of good, the shadow where the light ought to be. 'The devil is a vacuum,' as a friend of mine once remarked to the no small bewilderment of a group of listeners, in whose imagination the

devil was anything but a vacuum. Evil is not an intruder in an otherwise perfect universe; finiteness presumes it. A thing is only seen to be evil when the capacity for good is present and unsatisfied. Evil is not a principle at war with good. Good is being, and evil is not-being. When consciousness of being seeks further expression, and finds itself hindered by its limitations, it becomes aware of evil."

Here then we have reminiscences of Plato, the Platonic theory of good as being and evil as not-being. We pass to a second quotation:

"What you are seeking, young man, is more abundant life, and that is equivalent to seeking God. Life *is* God. 'Every good and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights.' And when the tendency goes round and works havoc and ruin in the world, it still remains a quest for God, although a blundering one. It is a misuse of Divine energy. The man who got drunk last night and gratified his lower nature in that delirious hour would be surprised if you were to tell him, when you see the result, that he was really seeking God; but so it is. He wants life, and thinks he can get it this way. This is the reason why morbid excitement and the craving for amusement have such power in human lives to-day. Your *roué* in Piccadilly, who went out to destroy innocence, was seeking life while spreading death. It seems almost blasphemy to say it, but he was seeking God, and thinking—O woeful blunder! —that he would find Him by destroying something that God has made beautiful and fair."

Here the Pantheist is speaking, and Mr. Campbell's reasoning is quite logical. If God is everything and if I am a part of God, then everything I do must be a part of Him, and it becomes difficult on any logical grounds to find a basis for any theory of sin. Now let us turn to a third quotation:

"It is time we had done with unreal talk about sin. Sin is the murder-spirit in human experience. 'Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?' Strong language; but I suppose the man who first used it must have known what he was talking about. Pomposity is sin, because it is egoism; self-complacency and contemptuousness are sin for the same reason. Cupidity is sin, whether in a burglar or in a doctor of divinity. A bitter, grasping, cruel, unsympathetic spirit is sin, no matter who shows it. The scribe and the Pharisee are too much with us, and the religious ideal needs to be rescued from their blighting grasp to-day as much as ever it did. Of all forms of sin, an arrogant, malignant, self-satisfied assumption of righteousness is the worst and the hardest to eradicate."

And so on. Here it is the Christian preacher who is speaking, and even though we do not consider that Mr. Campbell covers the whole of the ground when he tells us that sin is selfishness, we entirely concur with his denunciation of the love of self in every class and every society. But after we have passed all these three extracts in review (and they are each typical of things Mr. Campbell often says) we remain more than ever in difficulties as to what Mr. Campbell's theory of evil really is. Are we to take him as a Platonist and say that evil is not-being? Or are we to take him as a Pantheist and say that there is really no such thing as evil at all? Or are we to take him as a Christian teacher and listen to his eloquent denunciations of wickedness in the world? And if, as he tells us, the world is an experiment without the risk of failure, how does it come about that whether in the world or in the Church there are such innumerable signs of failure, such terrible

instances of incapacity to reach the ideal—that there is so much sin and misery and selfishness in the world? We venture to think that thoughtful persons will hardly feel that Mr. Campbell's "New Theology" has made much advance in solving the problem of the universe.

Let us examine further some of the causes of Mr. Campbell's difficulties. Throughout, as one would expect, difficulties about the Fall assume a very prominent place. The whole Christian doctrine of sin, in his opinion, is the result of mistaken ideas about the Fall.

"The theological muddle is largely caused by the inability of many people to free themselves from archaic notions which have really nothing to do with Christianity, although they have been imported into it. The principal of these, in relation to the question of sin, is the doctrine of the Fall. This doctrine has played a mischievous part in Christian thought, more especially, perhaps, since the Reformation."

Now we can quite understand that a reaction from teaching about "total depravity" and such similar language may lead to very unfair and prejudiced criticism, but what Mr. Campbell, and so many critics like him, fail to see is that the fact of sin, and the whole Christian doctrine about sin and Atonement, are quite apart from and independent of any particular doctrine concerning the Fall. The theology of the Fall hardly appears in the Old Testament. It has left hardly any traces, if any at all, in the Gospels, and if any one will read attentively the Epistle to the Romans he will see that there, too, the whole argument is entirely independent of the passage about the Fall. The basis of St. Paul's teaching is not the Fall of Man but the fact of sin: this he proves both objectively, by the state of the existing world at the time when he wrote, and subjectively by his personal and religious experience.

Because a righteous God must feel wrath against sin, therefore salvation is necessary for mankind, and whether the story of the Book of Genesis be an historical fact or an allegory that argument will still hold good. St. Paul's idea about the Fall only appears in two places, both very obscure, and the logical connexion with the rest of his doctrine is that the story of the Fall embodies a theory of the origin of sin. It does not explain sin, because sin is something that exists.

At the present time there is, and there is rightly, a reaction against some of the extremer forms of the Reformation doctrine. Both Biblical criticism and the study of ethnology make it impossible for most people to believe in the story of the Fall as an historical fact. A one-sided conception of the meaning of evolution makes a large number of people desire to construct a theory of life which shall have no place in it for any fall in man. But none of these changes in thought and none of these theories do away with the actual facts which have made people in the past believe in sin, and which led to such speculations as those concerning the origin of evil. No theory of evolution can explain away facts, and the fact is this—that man, so far as we can see, alone amongst created beings has the gift of conscious knowledge of right and wrong, the power of choosing right and rejecting wrong, and that he has often chosen the wrong and rejected the right. The result of this has been that state of mankind which we call sinful, which is attacked by so many preachers in such vigorous language, by none more so than by Mr. Campbell. There may have been—probably there is—exaggeration in the Christian language and the Christian preaching, as there is in the language of the Stoic philosopher. It is possible to take a perverted view of the condition of mankind; but the fact remains that

this phenomenon which we call sin, this failure to attain the ideal, is a characteristic of human life, and no philosophy which does not take it into account is in the least adequate as a theory of the universe. And our knowledge about sin is not confined to what we see. It is a fact of our own personal experience. We know that we have a conscience which tells us what is right and what is wrong. We know that we can blur and destroy that conscience as we can blur and destroy other gifts. We know that we constantly think and desire to do what is clearly, as our conscience tells, not right: that there is a struggle, and that, unless we are victorious in this struggle, the tendency to do wrong will increase. We feel that we are ourselves in revolt against something which is higher; that if we have an ideal it may very likely help us to do what is right. We inevitably put sin in antithesis to righteousness and to God. The theologians tell us that sin in its essence is a revolt against righteousness, which is God. Here, as elsewhere, no doubt we are using what the Dean of Westminster has called "the language of necessarily imperfect symbolism," but at any rate we feel that the Christian theory explains and accounts for the facts and forms a basis for a higher morality, that it has made possible the moral progress of the world. We feel that Mr. Campbell's theory affords no explanation of the facts of life, and no basis for the ethical teaching which, as he so constantly reminds us, is the only part of Christianity which is to him of any value.

IV

We do not know that it is necessary for us to dwell at very great length on Mr. Campbell's theory about the Person of our Lord. Like so many teachers of his

character he begins, as we expect, by a somewhat conventional eulogy of the Founder of Christianity, which is couched in that patronizing phraseology which seems to be popular.

"It is no use trying to place Jesus in a row along with other religious masters. He is first and the rest nowhere; we have no category for Him. I am not trying to prove the impossible, namely, that Christianity is the only true religion and the rest are all false. We shall get on better when that kind of nonsense ceases to be spoken."

The rest of his discussion on this subject is devoted to reasserting the traditional language of Christianity with quite a different meaning, and the distinction between his teaching and the ordinary Christian doctrine is fundamental. Traditional Christianity, following the teaching of S. Paul and the New Testament, tells us in Mr. Campbell's words that

"The second person in the Trinity, who was co-equal and co-eternal with God the Father, laid aside His glory, became incarnate for our salvation, was born of a virgin, lived a brief, suffering life, wrought many miracles, died a shameful death, rose again from the tomb on the second morning after He had been laid in it, and ascended into Heaven in full view of His wondering disciples."

Of this and similar doctrines he tells us:

"There is a sense in which all this is true, but it is commonly expressed in such a way that the truth is lost sight of. Literally understood, it is incredible. The only way to get at the truth in every one of these venerable articles of the Christian faith will be to shed the husk, and that we must do without hesitation or compromise."

A restatement of this doctrine begins by telling us that though we can speak of the Divinity of Christ we cannot speak of the Deity. Christ's personality was Divine because it was the one life which consistently and from first to last was lived in the terms of the whole, and therefore was Divine. But "in a sense, everything that exists is Divine," though "it can hardly be seriously contended that a crocodile is as much an expression of God as General Booth." "General Booth is Divine in so far as love is the governing principle of his life. Jesus was Divine simply and solely because His life was never governed by any other principle." "The Jesus of history did not possess the consciousness of Deity during His life on earth. His consciousness was as purely human as our own." According to theologians Christ "assumed human nature, but He was eternally Divine before He did so," and there is no need "to refute this argument; the trend of modern thought is already doing so most effectually." This "is not Unitarianism," because Unitarianism "has been just as prone to dualism as the extremest Trinitarianism." Christ is Divine because man is Divine.

Side by side with this definition of the Person of our Lord, which makes Him represent the Divine in man, we have a further doctrine of the Eternal Christ. "Jesus is the fullest expression of that eternal Divine man on the field of human history"; there is "the archetypal eternal Divine Man, the source and sustenance of the universe, and yet transcending the universe." "The idea of a Divine Man, the emanation of the infinite, the Soul of the universe, the source and goal of all humanity, is ages older than Christian theology. . . . It is a true, indeed an inevitable, conception, if we hold anything like a consistent view of the immanence of God in His universe. With what God have we to do

except the God who is eternally man?" This is "the eternal Christ." "According to the New Testament writers Jesus was and is the Christ, but in His earthly life His consciousness of the fact was limited. But, as we have come forth from this fontal manhood, we too must be to some extent expressions of this eternal Christ. . . . Fundamentally our being is already one with that of the eternal Christ, and faith in Jesus is faith in Him."

It hardly seems necessary to give more illustrations of Mr. Campbell's teaching. As we read his words we seem to hear strange reminiscences of teaching of long ago. We have already shewn how the problems that beset Mr. Campbell were the same problems as those of the Gnostics of old. It is the same in his doctrine of free will, the same in his difficulty with regard to the existence of evil, the same in his doctrine of the Person of Christ. Here we have just the separation of Jesus and the Christ which we find in Valentinus. Here again we have Christianity stated in the language of a decadent Pantheism.

We are quite sure that Mr. Campbell does not represent what the Church has taught, what the Bible teaches, or what we believe to be true; but we should like to ask one further question. Is what he teaches any easier for us to believe at the present day than what the Church teaches? Is it easier to believe in "a Divine man, the emanation of the infinite, the Soul of the universe"? The language is unreal, mystical. It has no authority, it does not come to us with authority, it has no evidence in its favour. It may attract a few minds, as Theosophy and mysticism always have attracted certain minds, but it is so unreal, so untrue to the facts of life and experience, with its perversion—we can call it nothing else—of Christianity

that it will not be a Gospel for the age. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Campbell has perverted and distorted Christian truth. Christianity has always taught us that Christ was God and the Son of God, and it was because He was God that He was able to reveal human nature in its ideal aspect; and so "because He became man He made it possible that we should become God." *Αὐτὸς ἐνηνθρώπησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν*, as said Athanasius. We are able, we believe, to attain to what is the ideal and the goal of our nature, not merely because He is the same as we are, in that He has taken our nature upon Him, but because He is different from us. By that Divine nature of His He is able to represent humanity as it should be, not as it is. It does not help us to attain our ideal by protesting that humanity is what it is not.

V

Mr. Campbell's treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement is very characteristic. He begins, as we might naturally expect, by a statement of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement similar in character to his statement concerning other Christian doctrines. It is needless to say that it is a caricature of what is taught. The conventional doctrine of the Atonement, as he calls it, is stripped of everything which makes it both ethical and real, and is then attacked for being un-ethical. But the crude view which is here imputed to theologians has never been taught by any theologian of any merit from the Reformation onwards. It is sometimes a fashion to criticize, and criticize severely, Luther's statements about the Atonement, not as Luther expounded them but as it is assumed that he expounded them. But it will be found that he never taught the doctrine in the

crude way which is ascribed to him. What we often consider to be in him only forensic was corrected by a strong element of mysticism, and he, as much as his critics at the present day, thought that the Atonement was not only done for us but done in us.

Further, Mr. Campbell wishes it to be quite clear that the Bible is not the place in which to obtain our knowledge of what the Atonement means; in fact, there is no theory of the Atonement in the New Testament.

"The Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine theories, and that of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are not mutually consistent, and Paul is not always consistent with himself.

"At present Paul's opinion on this great subject is by many people supposed to be decisive. Paul says this, and Paul says that, and when Paul has spoken there is no more to be said. But why should it be so? Paul's opinion is simply Paul's opinion, and not necessarily a complete and adequate statement of truth. It is entitled to be considered weighty because it is the utterance of a great man, and a great seer of truth, as well as being the earliest writing on the subject which we possess. Any man of the moral and intellectual eminence of Paul is entitled to reverence when he speaks, whether his views are in the Bible or not."

When we come to Mr. Campbell's opinion, we find in his exposition of the Atonement, if we content ourselves with his positive statements, a great deal that we could gladly and willingly accept. As this is the best part of Mr. Campbell's work we will quote a somewhat lengthy passage:

"It should now be plain why the doctrine of the Atonement has been so closely associated with the doing away of sin; it is because, as we have seen, the root-idea of Atonement is the assertion of the fundamental oneness of man with man and all with God. Sin is the

divisive, separating thing in our relations with one another, and with God the source of all, so the assertion of our oneness involves getting rid of sin. If we ask how this is to be done, the answer is simple enough: the only way to get rid of selfishness is by the ministry of love. What is it that is slowly winning the world from its selfishness to-day, and lifting it gradually into the higher, purer atmosphere of universal love? There is but one thing that is doing it, and that is the spirit of self-sacrifice. Wherever you see that, you see the true Atonement at work. There can be no doubt about the final issue, for behind the spirit of love is infinity, whereas the spirit of selfishness is essentially finite. On the field of human history the death of Jesus is the focus and concentrated essence of this age-long atoning process, whereby selfishness is being overcome, and the whole race lifted up to its home in God. Until Jesus came, no self-offering had been so consistent and so complete. No selfish desire could find lodgment in His pure soul. He showed men the ideal life by living it Himself—the life which was perfectly at one with God and man. In a selfish world that life was sure to end on a Calvary of some kind, but the very fact that it did so demonstrated the completeness of its victory over all considerations of self-interest. Selfishness lost the battle by seeming to gain it. God was behind the life of Jesus just because it was the life of perfect love, the life which was a perfect gift to the whole; therefore that life immediately arose in power in other lives, and has gone on increasing its benevolent sway over human hearts ever since. This is the Atonement, and it is rightly associated with the cross of Jesus in the minds of men, for the cross is the sum and centre of it all."

All this is very true, and it is admirably put; but why and how has the world, if not Mr. Campbell, learnt it? It has learnt it through the continuous, recurring influence of the belief in the reality of the Atonement by the Son of God, and through the continuous study of

the writings of the New Testament. The human race did not discover this unaided; it came to them through the revelation in Christ as interpreted in the New Testament. That revelation has taught us something profoundly different and on a different plane and level from anything which other books have taught us: while they have presented what is incomplete, it presents what is complete. We can read the whole history of the developement of the idea of sacrifice from the earliest ethnic systems; we can see how the old crude ideas were, under the influence of Jewish Monotheism, idealized and purified until they have taught men the deep and profound lessons of union with God, of the need of atonement for sin, of the offering to God of all that is highest and best in us. We can see the time come when this system begins to break down, when people still needing atonement ask, Can the blood of bullocks and goats really cleanse from sin? Then in a world yearning for sacrifice, but doubting about sacrifice, comes the life of Jesus, which exhibits a life of perfect sacrifice on earth, ending with an heroic death. The disciples of Jesus, guided by His own words, interpreted this life in the light of the prophetic and sacrificial teaching of the Old Testament, which they knew so well and which we know so imperfectly. Everything that that sacrificial system had claimed to do His death had done. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, His death was the original of which the sacrifices were the copy and shadow. The whole language of the sacrificial system might therefore be transferred to Christ, not by way of metaphor but by way of reality. The sacrifices were the metaphor, the shadow—the death of Christ was the reality. But why was this sacrifice so different from other sacrifices? Because it was a sacrifice of will, because it was self-sacrifice, because it revealed

the love of God for man, because it shewed what God was in His real Nature. But were the life and death of Christ merely a sort of drama, enacted to give an instance of heroic self-sacrifice to men, or was it merely an act of human heroism? Both these suggestions are thrown out nowadays, but neither would account for the power of the Atonement, or enable us to feel that the teaching was real. As Mr. Walker, one of Mr. Campbell's critics, puts it—

"It was always the Cross on which Christ died, in some real sense, *because of our sins and for our salvation.* Is it necessary to seek to reduce it to some set formula? I do not think so. We should inevitably omit something, or perhaps bring in something of our own merely. Better to stand reverently in the presence of that Cross. The Cross of the Sinless in a world of sin speaks for itself, and, in spite of all denials, it will continue to speak to the consciences of men. It is enough to say that the Cross on which Christ 'tasted death for every man' was the Divinely appointed means whereby God's forgiving Love went forth to men so as to save them from sin and self, and therefore also from the consequences of the merely self-centred life."[1]

The point we wish to emphasize is that the lesson mankind has learnt from the Cross of Christ it has learnt because it felt that, however one might explain it, the Cross of Christ, the death of Christ, was a necessary act of self-sacrifice on His part. God became man for the sin of mankind: it was the death of the Son of God, and therefore it revealed that which was above man. It was an Atonement, a necessary atonement for sin, and therefore it was real. It is these two beliefs which have made the Cross of Christ an influence. How we may explain the Atonement we may

[1] W. L. Walker, *What about the New Theology?* p. 197.

not be able to say, but when we read the long history of the doctrine of the Atonement, the spirit in which we should do so is not that of pointing out how wrong every one was, but of seeing how true every one was. Each age felt that the death of Christ saved them from the form in which evil had come. Athanasius, in the corrupt life of the fourth century when the world seemed very evil, saw how, through the Cross, the Divine image was restored to mankind. The Christian missionary of the Dark Ages, living in a world which seemed peopled by evil spirits, knew that he and those who listened to him had received salvation from the powers of darkness in the Cross of Christ. The mediaeval theologian, brooding over the tremendous majesty of the Divine sovereignty, feeling how sin was an appalling violation of that majesty and sanctity, felt that a great sacrifice had been offered and a great reparation paid. The Reformer, haunted with a continual sense of his own sin, thrown back on the introspection of his individual life, and feeling his awful unworthiness, found in the Cross his salvation. The modern thinker, appalled by the inadequacy of his own consciousness of guilt, sees in the contrition of Christ the true ideal contrition. None of them were wrong: they are all right. It is only wrong when a particular aspect of the Atonement is lifted into being necessary orthodox doctrine, when a scheme of salvation is put before us, when a human interpretation of the Atonement is put in the place of the Atonement.

When we read Maurice's stern protest against the form of theology of his own day we can sympathize with him. There is a great deal in what Mr. Campbell writes which is, we will not say true, but a half-understood representation of what is true. He knows a little about Semitic origins, a little about modern

theories of sacrifice, a little about S. Paul's rabbinical learning; but he does not know enough about anything to use his knowledge properly, and he has not the sense of reverence and respect for the great thinkers who have preceded him to enable him to re-interpret the Gospel to the present day. So far as we are aware the world is not suffering from the unreal presentation of an orthodox theory of Atonement; it is suffering much more because it is only laboriously adapting its mind to new and destructive criticism, and we do not think that Mr. Campbell helps it to do so.

VI

There are many more points in Mr. Campbell's book upon which we might dwell. In all we should find the same element of half-truth; but it is hardly worth while to deal with it in greater detail, and we propose to ask rather, Where is the fundamental error underlying Mr. Campbell's writings? And (since we consider him typical of a very large body of thought) What are the more serious difficulties at the present day? The first point we should put in the form of a quotation from Dr. Forsyth, in an article on "The Newest Theology" in the *British Weekly*.

"*Wherein*," he asks, "*does the theological situation to-day differ from that of thirty or fifty years ago—especially on the progressive side?* And the answer appears to me to carry us to the point I am always pressing but cannot easily get people to face—the point of our central and final authority. It is a question which does not trouble those who live spiritually from hand to mouth, and are satisfied with the beauties, the charities, the graciousness generally, of the religious life. Nor does it weigh on those who are immersed in the philanthropies or politics which engross the hour. But it

is the question of the day in those Churches and sections of society where men still have the educated habit of thoroughness, and the persistent resolution to know just where they honestly are. It is the question wherever the pursuit of perfection takes the place of slipshod religionism, and where men are sure that no Church can continue to stand unless it have a definite relation to a positive authority, and a real sympathy with every effort to force attention to that point. No Church, no preacher, knows where he is till he has a sure sense of his relation to such an authority. The Bible as a book has gone in that final sense. What replaces it? Is it in your own reason you find your Master? It is the urgency of this question of authority that makes the great difference between the position to-day and that of half a century ago."[1]

What is to be our authority? That is the question Dr. Forsyth asks, and on one point Mr. Campbell will agree with him, his statement that the Bible has gone in the sense of a final authority. In that sense we should also agree with him, but we should not feel that this was entirely new. The only change is that modern criticism has brought home to the Protestant world the inadequacy of the Bible as a final authority. Having recognized that, let us state at once that it is only for those who accepted in its crudest form the Bible and the Bible only as their authority that the present situation makes any real change. The result of the newest criticism has only been to continue a process which began when Erasmus first attempted to criticize the Bible in an historic sense. The change from the Middle Ages has been a slow and complicated one, hampered not only by fear of unorthodoxy but by the fact that Protestantism stereotyped a particular stage of the process. It has been throughout the work of scholars. The

[1] *The British Weekly*, March 7, 1907.

authority of the Vulgate had to be overthrown, and the authority of the scholastic interpretation which treated the Bible like a big law book. Allegory had to yield to history, traditional interpretation to grammar, and it is that change which is only being continued at the present day in what is called the higher criticism. The higher criticism does not overthrow the Bible: it only introduces another and we believe a more rational method of interpreting it. It has made the problems of the Old Testament very much less difficult; it brings out its reality and spiritual religion. It is only to those to whom the Bible has been the one, only, final authority that the difficulty is really serious. But the Church of England has always laid down in one way or another in its many formulae that the Christian faith is older than the New Testament. And as Mr. Walker remarks:

"This faith, I would next point out, does not rest primarily on any *Scriptures*. The New Testament was the *product* of this faith, not its foundation. There was no such Book in the hands of the earliest Christians. But there was in them a glowing enthusiasm of love for God and for humanity, kindled by simple faith in Christ and His Cross."[1]

To us the Christian faith is that faith which we know historically to have been taught by the Church from the beginning, and which has been enshrined and formulated in the great Creed which is the ultimate product of centuries of Christian thought and controversy and of four great Councils of the Church. Its authority is twofold. On the one side it represents the teaching of the universal Church; on the other side it may be proved by most certain warrant of Scripture. In the authority of the Church as interpreting Scripture and as

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 18.

controlled by Scripture we can, in the present day, find a quite adequate basis of belief.

No doubt we shall be reminded at once that the ultimate authority is reason; that is Dr. Forsyth's solution, as it is Mr. Campbell's. The ultimate authority for each individual quite truly is his own reason and his own conscience; that one can never escape from. You may accept the infallibility of the Pope, but it requires an act of reason, conscious or unconscious, to assent to it, and no one can escape from the ultimate individual decision. But Christianity claims to be a revelation, and we ask in what documents or in what form the contents of that revelation are contained. We are ourselves quite satisfied with the answer that we can give—the Bible interpreted by the Church, the doctrine of the Church as corroborated by the Scriptures. That is not a mechanical authority. To seek for mechanical authority which will abnegate the functions or the powers of reason is to flee from our individual responsibility. Our authority demands from every thoughtful person the use of the gifts that God has given him; but he is able to use those gifts not wandering without a chart over a trackless ocean, but going through the uncertain voyage of life with a knowledge and a teaching which will be, if he is willing, a sufficient guide. It is an authority which gives a healthy creed to the simple-minded, which does not bind us with the fetters of the past, nor submit us to a spiritual despotism, but provides for all the more thoughtful the material needed for working out the great problems of life and salvation.

For our second point we would take a characteristic utterance of Mr. Campbell, "Religion is necessary to mankind, but Churches are not." Our answer would be that because religion is necessary to mankind therefore Churches are—or rather, to put it more correctly, the

Church is—necessary. Mr. Campbell's book contains a great deal of a certain sort of fashionable carping against the Christian Churches, although he admits incidentally that they do a large amount of good. We are as conscious as any one that the organized Christian societies of the world are very inadequate representations of their ideal; but, as we look at the condition of the world and at the life of the great mass of our fellow-countrymen, we are firmly convinced that it is not primarily in the Churches that the fault lies. The Christian ideal is imperfectly realized, but it is within the Churches, and not outside them, that it is most adequately represented. No doubt we are in a sense to blame—every one is—for every sin that our brother commits; but the fashionable language which would suggest that all the good in the world lies among those persons who entirely renounce the authority of the Church and the obligations of religion is to us absolutely untrue. It is cant, and nothing but cant. Much of the reaction against Christianity arises not primarily because the Churches are antiquated, but because men wish to live a selfish and material life, and Christianity is a check and restraint on them. We do not deny the existence of many good and high-minded men outside the Church, but the good men and the good women for the most part are now, as they have been in the past, earnest workers in the Christian Churches. The good work that is done is done directly or indirectly because of the Christian societies realizing more adequately than others the lessons of Christianity. It is not in revolt from the Churches, but in a higher realization of the ideal of the Church, that the remedy must come. Above all it is because the inadequate conception of "Churches" has taken the place of the Church as a great ideal.

We are not speaking now simply in the interests of our own or of any other particular community. We do not wish to use any language that would un-church, as the phrase is, our fellow Christians. What we would put clearly forward is that it is just in this spirit of disintegration and of individualism that the theological difficulties at the present time arise. We do not desire to hamper individual thought in any way, but the individual thought should be the reverent thought of one who has behind him the whole tradition of Catholic Christianity, not the precarious speculation of one who starts from some particular sect. It is just here that Mr. Campbell's theology fails, and fails completely. The problems he deals with are problems that we all have to face. The solutions that he gives us often contain an approximation to the truth, but he fails because he starts as an individualist—and shall we say as a Protestant?—and not with the life of corporate Christianity behind him. He fails because his attitude towards the Christianity of the past and the Christianity of the present is not that of the reverent scholar, who knows that if he does his work he will advance beyond his teacher, and who should be ashamed of himself if he cannot, but of the clever critic. The clever critic fails, as he always will fail, because he has no reverence. The solution of the problems that Mr. Campbell raises will always be more adequate and true the more the thinker is Catholic and not merely Protestant, reverent and not only critical, believing in the working of the Spirit of God in the Christian Society rather than assuming that the place where God's Spirit works is everywhere but in the historic Church. The greater the unity of the Christian world, the more nearly it preaches the true ideal of the Christian Church, the sooner it will attain to Christian truth.

IV

THE ATHANASIAN CREED[1]

THE use and value of the *Quicunque Vult*, or, as it is commonly called, the Athanasian Creed, is one which causes much anxious thought. It may be convenient, therefore, if we attempt a careful review of the present position of opinion as to the history, origin, authority and use of this ancient document. During recent years, moreover, considerable additions have been made to our knowledge, and a number of studies have been produced which demand careful attention. The whole subject in fact is one which in the face of recent discovery and the conditions of thought at the present day requires temperate reconsideration. We shall begin with a short review of the history of opinion.

I

At the time of the Reformation the *Quicunque* appears to have been universally looked upon as the work of S. Athanasius, being known not only in the Latin but also in a Greek version. The beginning of criticism as to its origin must be referred to Vossius,

[1] This article appeared first in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1908, Vol. lxv., No. 131.

who in his *De Tribus Symbolis*, published in 1642, disproved the Athanasian origin and suggested that it had really been composed in the eighth or ninth century. Ultimately influenced by certain MSS. which Ussher had discovered, he considered that it might have been written not later than the year 600. Between the time of Vossius and Waterland's great work, which was published in the year 1723, a long series of investigations appeared. Most of the ideas which have since been held were then first suggested, and the lines of discussion were laid down. Two opinions seem to have prevailed. On the one hand Paschasius Quesnel, in his edition of the works of Leo the Great, published in 1675, attempted to prove that the author was Vigilius of Thapsus, an African theologian who lived towards the end of the fifth century; and this theory obtained a large number of adherents. On the other hand a considerable body of opinion began to connect the work definitely with the history of the Gallican Church, ascribing it to a period not later than the fifth century. Ussher in 1647, without being more precise, thought that it was not later than the year 500. Montfaucon thought that it was a Gallican document of the early part of the fifth century. Antelmi, writing in 1693, definitely ascribed it to S. Vincent of Lerins. Everything which critical investigation up to this period had attained was summed up in the well-known work of Waterland, an admirable example of English scholarship. Following the general tendency of the ablest amongst previous investigators, he ascribed it to the Gallican Church at the beginning of the fifth century, and he suggested that it was the work of S. Hilary of Arles.

For the next 150 years very little seems to have been added to our knowledge of the subject. There is,

however, an interesting book by Harvey on *The History of the Creeds*, published in the year 1854, which is both able and original.[1] He ascribed the authorship to Victricius, who was Bishop of Rouen at the beginning of the fifth century, and thought that the date of the Creed was not much later than the year 400. We shall shortly have to consider the argument which suggested this conclusion. It was about the year 1870 that interest in England began to be acute on the use of the *Quicunque* in the services of the Church, and many of the investigations which were undertaken clearly arose from a controversial or practical point of view and not entirely in the interests of pure science. In 1872 Dr. Ffoulkes produced a work characterized by somewhat desultory learning and inconsequential reasoning, in which he boldly maintained that it was deliberately forged by Paulinus of Aquileia about the year 800, and put forward under the authority of the Emperor Charlemagne, in the interest of the controversy on the doctrine of the Double Procession.[2] Dr. Swainson and Dr. Lumby of Cambridge are responsible for a theory (based, we believe, originally on a suggestion of Dr. Westcott) that the *Quicunque* in its present form was put together about the year 870, but was a combination of two documents, both of them very much earlier in their origin.[3] It was thought that in that way what

[1] *The History and Theology of the Three Creeds.* By the Rev. William Wigan Harvey, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Rector of Buckland, Herts. (London: Parker, 1854.) The author was the editor of Irenaeus and the hero of the Ewelme scandal.

[2] *The Athanasian Creed: by Whom Written and by Whom Published; with other Enquiries on Creeds in general.* Reconsidered in an Appendix. By the Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, B.D. (London: J. T. Hayes, 1872.) Dr. Ffoulkes was strongly interested in the Roman controversy and the position of the Orthodox Church.

[3] *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds. Their Literary History; together with an Account of the Growth and Reception of the Sermon on the Faith*

are sometimes called the "damnatory clauses" might be proved to be no real part of the original structure of the document, and as a result of critical investigation might be omitted. The theory will demand a somewhat lengthy investigation. It is enough to say now that a careful study of Dr. Swainson's book, which contains evidence of considerable original investigation, will make it apparent that even in the hands of its own advocate the theory is untenable. He is obliged to supplement it by a further suggestion that there were various tentative editions of the *Quicunque* existing before the year 800, and it becomes impossible to believe that two or more different people should have constructed Creeds independently by the combination of the same two documents and that so little trace of the process should have survived. This theory, however, has obtained a considerable amount of assent and is supported in a modified form by Professor Harnack in his *History of Christian Dogma*.[1]

commonly called "*The Creed of St. Athanasius*." By C. A. Swainson, D.D., Canon of Chichester, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. (London: John Murray, 1875.)—*The History of the Creeds*, by J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Fellow of St. Catharine's College, and late Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Third edition. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1887.) The first edition was published in 1873.

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iv. 134 [E.T.]: "It is extremely probable that the so-called Athanasian Creed, so far as the first half of it is concerned, is a Gallican Rule of Faith explanatory of the Creed of Nicaea. As such it was from the fifth century onwards, by means of the theology of Augustine and Vincentius of Lerinum, gradually made into a course of instruction for the clergy, *i.e.* the monks, suitable for being committed to memory. . . . It is probable that in the course of the sixth century it essentially received its present technical form in Southern Gaul where the West-Gothic Spanish Arianism still continued to provoke opposition. In the middle of the sixth century it, or at least a recension very similar to it, was already current as the authoritative course of

The publication of these theories led to renewed interest in the subject and to further and more careful historical investigation; and we owe to the long, laborious, and scholarly work of Mr. Ommanney and Dr. Burn a very much deeper knowledge of the manuscripts and history of the *Quicunque*. Mr. Ommanney[1] discovered and published a considerable number of unknown commentaries on the Creed, and these, together with other investigations of his, began to throw grave doubts on the correctness of Dr. Swainson's theory. Dr. Burn obtained in the year 1888 a prize given by Bishop Lightfoot to the junior clergy of Durham for an essay on the Athanasian Creed, and then, after devoting his spare time for seven years to further investigations, produced in the Cambridge series of *Texts and Studies* a dissertation on the Athanasian Creed and its early commentaries. This was followed up by his *History of the Creeds*, published

instruction for the clergy in Southern Gaul, and was together with the Psalms learned by heart. It got into the decisions of single Councils from the Psalm-books and breviaries of the monks and clergy, in so far as the practice had here begun of appealing to single statements in this rule of faith. Starting from here it gradually came to be the Confession of the Frankish Church in the eighth and ninth centuries. It was perhaps then that the second Christological half was added, the origin of which is completely wrapped in obscurity; it was, of course, put together before the ninth century." In vol. v. p. 303 he again alludes to the question in a long note, in which he attempts to defend the conclusions stated above against the criticisms of Loofs on internal grounds.

[1] Mr. Ommanney's books are as follows: *The Athanasian Creed, with special reference to the so-called Damnatory Clauses.* A paper read at a Ruridecanal Chapter. London, 1872.—*The Athanasian Creed: its Use in the Services of the Church.* A paper read at the Bath and Wells Diocesan Conference. London, 1872.—*The Athanasian Creed: an Examination of Recent Theories respecting its Date and Origin.* London, 1875.—*The Early History of the Athanasian Creed.* London, 1880.—*The S.P.C.K. and the Creed of St. Athanasius.* 1884.—*A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed.* Oxford, 1897.

in 1899. He has added very largely to our knowledge both of the manuscripts of the *Quicunque* and of the early commentaries written upon it, and has cleared up a number of doubtful questions.[1] The works of Mr. Ommanney and Dr. Burn mark a real advance. It is interesting to notice that although they agree in their main conclusion, connecting the *Quicunque* with the early history of the Gallican Church and the School of Lerins, Mr. Ommanney thinks that it was the work of S. Vincent, while Dr. Burn suggests—he does not do more—S. Honoratus, the founder of the community. No other considerable works have appeared since, so far as we are aware, but various suggestions have been thrown out in reviews. Dr. Kattenbusch[2] suggests that the Creed dates from the time before and not after the publication of S. Augustine's work on the Trinity, that is, he would put it as early as 410 at latest. Dr. Loofs,[3] on the other hand, while criticizing with great acuteness the two-document theory, is inclined to think that the Creed was the result of a process of growth. Finally, the distinguished Benedictine scholar Dom Morin,[4] who is, as is well known, engaged upon a critical edition of the writings of Caesarius, who was Bishop of Arles from 503 to 543, has suggested that the *Quicunque Vult* is to be attributed to him. This

[1] *The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries.* By A. E. Burn, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. "Texts and Studies," edited by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D., vol. iv. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1896.) *An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum.* By A. E. Burn, B.D. (London: Methuen & Co., 1899.)

[2] In a review of Dr. Burn's first work in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, No. 5, p. 138.

[3] In Herzog, *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed. ii. p. 177. Article "Athanasianum."

[4] Dom G. Morin, "Le Symbole d'Athanase et son premier Témoin, Saint Césaire d'Arles," *Revue Bénédictine*, xviii. 1902, p. 337.

suggestion has been taken up by Mr. C. H. Turner in an acute and able paper on the Creeds, which will demand our careful attention.[1]

II

The first question which comes before us is that of the Athanasian origin. It is hardly, we think, necessary to discuss this at any length, as, although a work by Mr. Brewer[2] appeared in its defence in the year 1872, it is not held, so far as we know, by any critic or theologian of authority. The arguments against it may be shortly stated. All the evidence is in favour of Latin being the original language, the different Greek versions—and there are more than one in existence—shewing quite clearly signs of translation. Whereas the Latin version is contained in many early manuscripts, those of the Greek version are very much later. All the early testimony and early quotations are in Latin authors, and there are none in any Greek authorities for many hundred years after the time of Athanasius. Moreover the theology is definitely and decisively Latin, and although it is concerned with the two great heresies which existed in the lifetime of S. Athanasius—Arianism and Apollinarianism—yet it is not too much to say that the exposition of the doctrine could not have come from him; there are in fact statements to which he would

[1] *The History and Use of Creeds and Anathemas in the Early Centuries of the Church.* By Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. "The Church Historical Society." (London: S.P.C.K., 1906.)

[2] *The Athanasian Creed Vindicated, with an Appendix on the Proposed Revision of the Present Version.* (London: Rivingtons, 1871.)—*The Athanasian Origin of the Athanasian Creed,* by J. S. Brewer, M.A., Preacher at the Rolls, and Honorary Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. (London: Rivingtons, 1872.)

probably have objected. Moreover, as will appear subsequently, the attribution to S. Athanasius was probably not original, many earlier authorities which contained the document knowing nothing of the suggested authorship.

But although the *Quicunque* was certainly not by Athanasius there can be no doubt that the attribution to him has had a great deal to do with much of the authority which it possesses. There is little to be said for the opinion of Dr. Ffoulkes, which we referred to above, but the existence of a document believed to be by S. Athanasius, and apparently favouring the doctrine of the Double Procession, was of extreme value in the controversy with the Eastern Church, and thus at various crises in that controversy it has come prominently to the front. That may well be the reason why after the year 800 we hear so much more of it than before. That was certainly the reason why it was so prominent just before the Reformation, at the time of the Council of Florence; and the attribution to S. Athanasius, no doubt with other reasons which we shall mention later, led to the prominent position it occupies in the English Prayer Book. This attribution then has been very important in the history of the *Quicunque*; but of course its authority as a Creed is independent of the question of authorship. To prove that it was by Athanasius would not for that reason give it any real *authority*. There are confessions of faith written by Athanasius, as by other doctors of the Church, which carry weight owing to the respect felt for their author, but have no authority. On the other hand, a document which is not by him, even if it has been mistakenly attributed to him, may still have authority, if it is formally adopted by the general voice of the Church.

III

The next point which comes up for consideration is the two-document theory of Dr. Swainson and Dr. Lumby. It is conceded on all sides that from the year 870 there is abundant evidence for the existence of the *Quicunque* in its present form, and we shall make that accepted fact the starting-point of our investigations. Dr. Swainson's theory is that about that date it was put together in its present form out of two documents of which he finds traces in earlier authorities. In the year 798 Denebert, Bishop-elect of Worcester, made before Ethelhard, Archbishop of Canterbury, his profession of faith. In this he quoted clauses 1, 3-6, 20-22, 24 and 25 of the *Quicunque Vult*, and further promised to observe the decrees of the Popes and the six Catholic synods. All these clauses come from the first part. The second document is what is called the Trèves fragment. This is contained in a manuscript at present at Paris, of the eighth century, written in Lombardic characters. The writer states that he had found in a manuscript at Trèves a fragment which he proceeds to give. It contains clauses 27 to 40 of the *Quicunque*, with the exception of clause 35, and with a certain number of variations. Now with regard to these two documents it may be noticed that neither of them is a very solid foundation to build upon. Denebert in his profession quotes only those clauses which were necessary for his purpose, and there was no particular reason why he should quote the later part, which concerned matters clearly defined in the Councils of the Church to the decrees of which he expressed his adhesion. The Trèves fragment is, again, obviously and professedly a fragment, and begins in the middle of a sentence; this shews that the original from which it was copied was

mutilated. Moreover it is in the form of a sermon, and the variations from the original text can be more naturally explained on the assumption of free quotation than of a first draft. The positive arguments therefore in favour of the theory are not strong ; and since it was first formulated it has become quite untenable, because, apart from other evidence much of which is weighty, the *Quicunque* in its present form has been found in at least four manuscripts which undoubtedly belong to the eighth century—that is, at least seventy years before it was *ex hypothesi* put together. In the process of our investigation it will appear that there is considerable further evidence against the theory.

Side by side with this we may perhaps refer to the theory of Loofs,[1] mentioned above, that the *Quicunque Vult* has grown up by accretion. It may be said at once that any one who reads it carefully must have very grave doubts as to whether this is possible. From beginning to end it runs in the same balanced and antithetical style ; the two different parts are connected together by a clause which resembles those at the beginning and the end, and gives unity to the whole document. Moreover, although the manuscripts of the *Quicunque* shew the amount of variation in the text which is natural in any ancient document, there are no traces of any other recension. Of course in quotations and in the Trèves fragment, which was built on quotation, there are variations ; and some writers quote, of course, only a portion. All these facts can be explained quite naturally by the ordinary rules of historical quotation far better than by

[1] Loofs, *op. cit.* : "Die in No. 7 besprochenen *expositiones fidei* verhalten zu dem *Quicunque* nicht wie roh gesungene Reminiscenzen zu der sorgfaltig modulierten Melodie an die sich anklingen, sondern wie im Steinbruch gebliebene Bruchsteine sich zu einem Steine gleichen Ursprungs verhalten, den die glättende Macht eines Stromes um viele Meilen weiter theilabwärts gewälzt hat."

supposing that other documents exist of which no certain trace has been left. We shall find throughout the period from 500 to 800 a considerable number of scattered testimonies. It is far easier and more in accordance with all the rules of historical criticism to assume that these quotations come from knowledge of the *Quicunque*, than that it has been laboriously put together by a process of selection from a considerable number of scattered documents. It is an historical rule that the theory which supposes the smallest number of documents is the most probable. Neither on external nor internal grounds are there any real reasons for thinking that the *Quicunque* ever existed in a form differing at all substantially from that which we possess. Having therefore cleared away these two rival theories we must now investigate very carefully the evidence, external and internal, as to its origin.

IV

It is universally admitted that the *Quicunque* was in existence in its present form after the year 870, and it is contained in a considerable number of manuscripts undoubtedly of the ninth century. That must be our starting-point for our backward investigation. But recent discoveries have enabled us to put back the starting-point earlier still. Dr. Burn is able to enumerate at least four manuscripts of the eighth century which contain it, and if we are to trust the suggestion of Dr. Künstle[1] this evidence takes us back very much further, because, as he shews, almost all the eighth-

[1] *Antipriscilliana*, von Dr. Karl Künstle (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1905), p. 208. Dr. Künstle's book demands careful study, but a good deal of his speculation appears a little wild.

century Carolingian manuscripts are directly copied from originals of the sixth century or earlier. The intervening period was so disturbed that literary work and the production of manuscripts were almost impossible. It would be very unlikely that a document contained in four eighth-century manuscripts should belong to a later period than the sixth century.

Our next lines of investigation are ancient commentaries. Seven of these are known, for the most part contained in manuscripts of the ninth or tenth century, and the existence of such commentaries does not suggest a very recent origin. But, further, we find that these commentaries make use of one another. For instance, one called the Orleans commentary is found in ninth-century manuscripts, and makes use of at least four others; and these, again, are not independent of each other. We are therefore taken back to a period presumably earlier than the eighth century. Amongst the commentaries is one which has been generally ascribed (although without very adequate reason) to Venantius Fortunatus, Bishop of Poitiers, who died about the year 600. It has played a large part in the controversy concerning the history of the *Quicunque*. Its date and authority it is impossible to decide with any degree of exactness, but it is certainly difficult to place it later than the year 700. The combined evidence of these manuscripts and commentaries throws the *Quicunque* back to the sixth century.

But among the manuscripts is one to which reference has already been made, that containing the Trèves fragment. It was, as we have said, written in the eighth century, and it is undoubtedly copied from an earlier document. The scribe discovered a fragment at Trèves: that manuscript must have been written at some period earlier than he discovered it, and this evidence probably

takes us into the sixth century. Dr. Burn suggests that the fragment in question is possibly an extract from a sermon by Nicetius, Archbishop of Trèves from 527 to 566.

For the sixth century we have further evidence of a kind which seems quite conclusive. In the year 633 the fourth Council of Toledo met and published, as was usual with councils, a canon concerning the Faith. This canon is largely made up of extracts from the *Quicunque*, extending over both portions and including quotations from thirteen clauses. Various attempts have been made to evade this evidence, but we must agree with Dr. Burn in thinking that it is absolutely conclusive. The extracts follow the order of the *Quicunque*. Moreover it has been shewn that the canon was constructed by blending extracts from that document with another confession of faith called the *Fides Damasi*. Now it might be conceivable that the *Quicunque* had been constructed by some ingenious compiler out of careful extracts from this canon of Toledo, but it becomes quite inconceivable that he should have carefully picked out all those passages which are not contained in the *Fides Damasi* in order to construct a new creed. It seems certain, therefore, that this canon of the Council of Toledo in 633 was drawn up by some one well acquainted with the *Quicunque*. But this is not an isolated phenomenon. In five successive Councils of Toledo between 589 and 693 we have what would naturally be considered reminiscences or quotations. The following extract from Dr. Swainson's work may be accepted as evidence of this statement:

"In the Council of Toledo, 589, we have, similarly, clauses 4, 5, 13, 33 *a*.

"In the Council of Toledo, 633, we have 4, 21, 22, 23 and 33.

"In the Council of Toledo, 638, we have the words of 21, 22, 23, 32 *a*, 34 *b*, 35 *b*, 36 *b*.

"In the Council of Toledo, 675, we have 3 *b*, 4, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, 35, 36 *b*.

"In the Council of Toledo, 693, we have 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 31."[1]

Our evidence takes us back so far by various independent lines to the sixth century. How much earlier can we get? An undoubted quotation occurs in a sermon which is now unanimously ascribed by all critics to Caesarius, Bishop of Arles from 503 to 543. As this extract is of some importance we shall quote it in full:

1. "Rogo et admoneo uos fratres carissimi ut *quicunque*
(40) *uult saluus esse fidem rectam catholicam* discat, *firmiter teneat inuiolatamque* conseruet. Ita ergo
15. oportet unicuique obseruare ut credat Patrem credat
16. Filium credat Spiritum Sanctum. *Deus Pater Deus Filius Deus et Spiritus Sanctus* sed *tamen non tres*
7. *Dii sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater talis Filius talis et Spiritus Sanctus.* Attamen credat unusquisque
31. fidelis quod Filius *aequalis* est *Patri secundum diuinitatem* et *minor est Patre secundum humanitatem* carnis quam de nostro assumpsit; Spiritus uero Sanctus ab utroque procedens."[2]

It will be noticed that this sermon contains extracts from both portions, and substantially, though not entirely, in the original order. Here we get the latest possible date which modern scholarship will allow. As we have said, Dom Morin and Mr. Turner both ascribe the authorship of the *Quicunque* to Caesarius, and it is quite clear that either he was acquainted with it or was the author of it. But without definitely deciding that question at present we must continue our backward

[1] Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 444.

[2] Burn, *An Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 151.

investigation. Avitus, who was Bishop of Vienne from 490 to 523, has quotations from the Creed. This evidence of course is not inconsistent with the Caesarian authorship. Previous to this date we have very clear resemblances in language in two authors, S. Vincent of Lerins and S. Augustine, but it is not so easy to decide in these cases whether we are dealing with quotations or with the original sources. With regard to S. Vincent of Lerins the words of Dr. Swainson may again be quoted. We have "in the writings of Vincentius of Lerins, words nearly resembling the clauses 3, 4, 5, 6 *a*, 30 *b*, 31, 32."[1] Although we cannot say with certainty which is the original, a comparison of certain passages seems to suggest that S. Vincent has somewhat modified the language of the *Quicunque* in view of the Nestorian controversy.[2]

With regard to the relation between the language of the *Quicunque* and that of S. Augustine, which is very close, the usual explanation is that it contains a summary of the Augustinian theology on the Trinity. This is probable. It is more likely on the whole that this method of exposition should first come from the writings of the great constructive theologian of the fourth century than from some anonymous and unknown source. At the same time it must be recorded that some writers at the present day are of a contrary opinion and consider the *Quicunque* the original source of this teaching. How close the resemblance

[1] Swainson, *Op. cit.* p. 444.

[2] For example compare the following: *Quicunque*, § 28. "Quia Dominus noster Iesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter et homo est." *Commonitorium*, c. 19. "Unus idemque Christus, unus idemque Filius Dei . . . unus idemque Christus Deus et homo." An example of close similarity in language is the following: *Quicunque*, § 5. "Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti." *Commonitorium*, c. 19. "Quia scilicet alia est persona Patris alia Filii alia Spiritus Sancti."

in language is in some cases the following short extract will shew:

"There is such a power of identity in the substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that whatever is said of each singly in themselves, must be understood, not in collective plurality, but singly. *For as the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God,* which nobody doubts to be affirmed of the Divine Substance, still we do not declare that most Glorious Trinity *to be three Gods, but one God.* In the same way, the Father is Great, the Son is Great, and the Holy Ghost is Great, yet they be not three Great, but one Great. For it is not of the Father alone, as they perversely say, but of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that it is written, 'Thou alone, O God, art Great.' The Father again is Good, the Son is Good, and the Holy Ghost is Good; but they be not three Good, but one Good, of whom it is said, 'None is Good but God only.' . . . *The Father therefore is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, the Holy Ghost is Almighty; and yet they be not three Almighties, but one Almighty,* of whom, and through whom, and in whom, are all things, to Him be glory. Whatever therefore God is said to be in Himself, is also said separately of each person, that is, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and at the same time of the very Trinity, not plurally but singly."[1] "That which the three persons of the Trinity are said to be in themselves, means not a triple plurality, but one and the very Trinity; *as the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God*; and the Father is Good, the Son is Good, the Holy Ghost is Good; *and the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, the Holy Ghost is Almighty; and yet there are not three Gods, or three Good, or three Almighties;* but one Good, *Almighty God,* the very Trinity."[2]

[1] Augustine, *De Trinitate,* v. 9. These two quotations are taken directly from Harvey, *op. cit.* ii. 562–564, whose translation has been used.

[2] Aug. *de Trin.* viii. 1.

To sum up the external evidence: It is impossible to ascribe the composition of the *Quicunque* to a later date than Caesarius of Arles, and it is probable that it was known to S. Vincent of Lerins. On the other hand, it is more likely on the whole that it was composed by one well acquainted with the writings of S. Augustine than that it was the source of his speculations.

V

Next as to the internal evidence. This was investigated with great thoroughness by Waterland. The ground has been gone over again by Dr. Burn, and he has substantially corroborated all Waterland's main contentions. The chief points are the following: In the first place, while the Creed has a marked resemblance to the theology of S. Augustine, it was quite clearly in its origin not Augustinian and probably not African, because while S. Augustine always used the word "essentia" as a translation of the Greek *οὐσία* the *Quicunque* uses the word "substantia." In the second place, the Creed shews no trace of the influence of Nestorianism or Eutychianism. And, although the rule cannot be considered absolute, it is not likely that a Confession of Faith drawn up after these heresies had arisen would contain no reference to them. For example, S. Vincent of Lerins wrote his well-known *Commonitorium* only two or three years after the outbreak of Nestorianism, but he deals with it with considerable fulness. It is difficult to conceive that this Creed should have been written in the fifth century, after the rise of those two heresies, without some reference to them. Moreover some of the language which is used, especially the analogy between the two natures in the person of Christ

and the relation of the soul to the body, ceased to be popular after the rise of Eutychianism, as capable of misuse by heretics. The language of the Creed has been studied with the very greatest care, and attempts have been made to find signs of later origin, but almost every passage in it can be paralleled by the writings of early theologians, and it is to the present writer clear that the earlier origin is more probable.

So far Waterland. The arguments in favour of his position have now been considerably strengthened by the fact that the exact situation which would lead to the production of such a document existed in the Western Church during the early half of the fifth century. Dr. Burn, whose arguments have been amplified and perhaps exaggerated by Dr. Künstle, first pointed out that this situation was created by Priscillianism. That somewhat obscure heresy seems to have combined a Sabellian and an Apollinarian tendency, a combination which exactly suits the language of the *Quicunque*. It is against these two tendencies that it is particularly directed, as is shewn by its insistence on the distinctness as well as the union of the Persons of the Trinity. And the specific reference to the resurrection of the body also touches on the errors of this heresy. Putting these various points together, the evidence in favour of the *Quicunque* belonging to a period earlier than the rise of Nestorianism, *i.e.* the year 429, is very strong.

VI

We are now in a position to consider the various possible theories as to the authorship of the Creed. We have mentioned that the attribution to Caesarius of Arles has the authority of Dom Morin upon its side,

and has been accepted by Mr. Turner.[1] As the former, however, wrote before he had seen some recent investigations he may possibly reconsider his opinion. At any rate we shall be in a far better position to judge of the arguments in its favour when he has produced his edition of the writings of Caesarius. Up till now he has adduced nothing which would not be equally well explained supposing that Caesarius were well acquainted with the language of the *Quicunque* and had learnt it by heart. We are bound to say that it seems to us at present that the reasons for an earlier date are too strong to enable us to accept this suggestion. We will, however, quote what Mr. Turner has to say in its favour. He suggests that the Semi-Pelagian School of Lerins would hardly be likely to have made so much use of S. Augustine's theology, and he then continues:

"But is there no writer, later than the middle of the fifth century yet earlier than the middle of the sixth, Gallican himself yet a profound student of the writings of St. Augustine, a compiler rather than a creator, yet a compiler of the first order, to whom the Athanasian Creed can be attributed? It is the merit of Dom Germain Morin to have supplied a tentative answer to these questions in proposing the name of St. Caesarius of Arles.

"Of course a guess, however brilliant, remains only a guess: and no doubt Morin, who has devoted many years to the laborious task of collecting and sifting the materials for an edition of St. Caesarius, lies under a natural temptation to look for the solution of vexed questions along the lines of his special study. But the parallels with which he illustrates from the writings

[1] It is interesting to note that this conclusion had also been arrived at by Mr. Cooper-Marsdin. Cf. *Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, claimed as Author of the Athanasian Creed.* By A. Cooper-Marsdin, B.D., Vicar of Borstal. (Rochester: T. Oldroyd, 1903.)

of Caesarius one after another of the characteristic turns of phrase in the *Quicumque*, though they do not actually prove identity of authorship, give the hypothesis at least the right to hold the field until a better one can be found to supersede it. And there are perhaps few hypotheses which have to fit in with so many *data* and which fit in with them all so well.

"Also, if Caesarius was the author, we have in his authorship a possible explanation of the use of the name of St. Athanasius. The evidence of the MSS. shows indeed that this description was not at first universal; and it may be that we have here to do only with one more example of the habit, equally incurable among ancient scribes and modern critics, of discovering a writer for every anonymous treatise. Yet St. Athanasius was perhaps hardly the Father on whom the thoughts of an ordinary scribe in the seventh or later sixth century would have run: and at no time was the pseudonymous employment of his name very common in the West—indeed the only striking instance of it (apart from the Creed itself) is in connexion with the books *de Trinitate* which are printed among the works of Vigilius of Thapsus. Caesarius, however, is exactly the man for our case, since he had a quite unique passion for borrowing material from earlier Fathers, working it up himself, and then publishing the composite result under their name rather than his own. Normally, of course, the writer to be thus exploited was St. Augustine—many of the sermons relegated by the Benedictine editors of St. Augustine to the appendix are made up of genuine Augustinian matter in a Caesarian dress—but Morin has detected in a MS. of the Cathedral library at Cologne (no. clxxi, saec. ix) a couple of homilies of indubitably Caesarian origin masquerading under the title 'sancti Anathasi.' On the whole, then, there seems good reason to believe that the same hand which penned the *Quicumque* prefixed to it the heading 'Fides sancti Athanasii,' and that the hand was that of Bishop Caesarius of Arles."[1]

[1] Turner, *op. cit.* pp. 74-7.

With regard to the last argument we are bound to say that it does not appeal to us very strongly. As we shall shew shortly, the attribution to S. Athanasius is not universal in the early manuscripts and commentaries. How it arose we cannot say, but if the name of Athanasius had been fixed to the Creed from the beginning it seems to us certain that it would have been found almost universally attached to it. Just the one point which Mr. Turner particularly makes is one that at present does not convince us. Failing further evidence we must decline to accept this suggestion.

It may be convenient next to consider the various theories which place the *Quicunque* before the time of S. Augustine. A writer in the eighteenth century—Speroni, whose works we have not seen—has suggested that Hilary of Poitiers was the author. Mr. Harvey suggested Victricius; Kattenbusch proposes a date earlier than S. Augustine's work on the Trinity; and Künstle thinks that it was produced in Spain, in the fourth quarter of the fourth century, as a document directed against Priscillianism. This last opinion is connected with theories as to the date of various Spanish Confessions of Faith, which are neither proved nor probable, and do not strengthen our opinion of the writer's judgement; but the whole question on which the early date depends is the connexion with the writings of S. Augustine; and, as we have already suggested, it certainly seems more likely that the belief and expressive language of the *Quicunque* should have its source in the writings of a great theologian than in some unknown writer in Spain, who was merely producing a formula for controversial purposes.

We come now to the third and on the whole the most prevalent theory, which connects the *Quicunque* with the School of Lerins, the community founded by

Honoratus on the little island off the southern coast of France, which had as decisive an influence on Christianity in Gaul as Iona or Lindisfarne had in these islands. Those who had been trained within its walls became bishops throughout Gaul, and the influence of its theology would spread in every direction. Whatever theory we may have as to the origin of the Creed its extension almost certainly belongs to the influence of Lerins. We have ourselves no doubt that S. Vincent was acquainted with the language of the *Quicunque*, as in all probability were Faustus and Honoratus, and all the conditions required for its composition are supplied by this solution. Although on the question of predestination the community of Lerins was opposed to the extremer Augustinian teaching, there is no reason why they should not have been influenced by his work on the Trinity, and we know that they were in direct contact with the thought of other portions of the Christian world. It is quite certain that S. Vincent had read Augustine if he had not read the *Quicunque*. Whether the author were Hilary of Arles, as Waterland suggested, or S. Vincent himself, or Honoratus, the founder of the community, as Dr. Burn suggests, is a point which cannot be determined. The writing is anonymous, and until we get more conclusive evidence it would be impossible to fix its authorship. Future investigation will no doubt help us further. We cannot consider that the various questions which we have discussed are in all cases answered with certainty, but it is to us fairly clear either that the *Quicunque* was the work of some member of the community of Lerins or that at any rate it was known and used there; and that it was through the influence of the members of that community that it obtained such general acceptance throughout the Gallican Church.

VII

We have next to consider the authority and use of the *Quicunque*. Whoever may have been its author its authority must ultimately depend upon its acceptance by the Church. Its early history is somewhat obscure, we do not know for what purpose it was originally written; but the first evidence that we have of its use suggests the reason why it became so widely known. In the canons of the Council of Autun held in the year 670 it is stated "if any presbyter, deacon, sub-deacon or clericus shall through negligence have failed to study the Creed (*Symbolum*) which the Apostles handed down under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the Faith (*Fides*) of St. Athanasius the prelate (*praesulis*), let him be condemned by the bishop."[1] This suggests that its formal use was for the education and training of the clergy. If that be so we can understand why the knowledge of it spread so widely. It was connected as we have seen with the brotherhood of Lerins, a brotherhood which supplied bishops for all the principal dioceses of Southern Gaul. All those who went out

[1] We have quoted this passage as the earliest, but the testimony that it gives to the use of the *Quicunque* in the training of the clergy is supported by a long list of authorities, which are given at length in the works we have referred to. Compare also Hincmar, c. 852 A.D. (*apud* Swainson, *op. cit.* 302): "Hincmar required that each of his presbyters should learn, at fuller length than any had yet done, an Exposition of the Creed and of the Lord's Prayer, according to the tradition of the orthodox Fathers, and so diligently instruct the people committed to him. Then he is to learn the preface to the canon, and the canon of the mass itself, and the prayers of the mass; and be able to read the 'Apostle' and Gospel, and know the words of the Psalms and the pauses by rule: and how to pronounce them from memory and the usual canticles. 'And also let every one commit to memory the Sermon of Athanasius on the Faith, of which the commencement is *Quicunque uult saluus esse*—and let him comprehend its meaning, and be able to explain it in the vulgar tongue (*communibus uerbis enuntiare queat*).'"

from there (such as Caesarius) would have learned it by heart, and would have been trained in its use. They would introduce the same custom in the dioceses over which they were appointed to preside, and in that way it would gradually spread as it did throughout Western Christendom. And there was every reason that it should spread. It was admirably adapted for the times when it was written; it expressed the orthodox belief in the current theological language in words admirably chosen and with an attractive rhythm. It was a time when Catholicism and Arianism were arrayed one against the other, not as two rival philosophies or religions but as two political causes. It was the soldier's watchword, and it meant to every one a description of the orthodox faith to which he was attached, and a reminder that he was not to be a traitor to the orthodox cause on the field of battle. How early it was used in the services of the Church we cannot say; its rhythmical form suggests that probably it was intended to be sung, and we know that the island of Lerins was famous for its Church hymns as well as for its Church teaching. It had then at this time all the authority of a popular and suitable exposition of the Faith, but in no sense had it the authority of a Creed.

The question must be raised, How did the name of Athanasius become attached to it? It was not original.[1]

[1] The facts are as follows: Out of twenty-two MSS. three have *Fides Catholica*, six have *Fides S. Athanasii* in some form (*S. Ath.*, *S. Ath. Epi.*, *S. Ath. Al.*, *S. Ath. Ep. Al.*), five combine the two—*Fides Catholica S. Athanasii Episcopi* (*Al.*), then we have *F.C. edita a S.A.A. epo.*, *F.C. tradita a S.A.A. epo.*, *Hymnus Athanasii de fide Trinitatis*, *Fides S. Anathasii Epi.* Of the commentaries six have only *Fides Catholica*, two *F.C.S.A. epi.*, one *F.C.S.A.* In quotations before the year 900 it is very variously described as *Catholica Fides*, *Sermo Athanasii de fide*, *Sermo Catholicae Fidei*, *Libellus de fide b. Ath. Alex. Epi.*, *Sermo Athanasii de Fide S. Trinitatis*. See Burn, *Athanasian Creed*, pp. 2, 3, 41.

It is not known by the writers of some of the earliest commentaries. It is not given in many early manuscripts, and it is probable that if the *Quicunque* had been called by the name of Athanasius from the beginning it would universally have borne that name. But the period was one when great persons' names became attached with considerable ease to documents. There were two other Confessions of Faith, one called the *Fides Damasi* and another called the *Fides Hieronymi*, but it is doubtful whether either Damasus or Jerome was responsible for them. Another document, the *Fides Romanorum*, was occasionally ascribed to Athanasius. One of the difficulties in studying the history of Christianity in Gaul is that apparently most of the documents and sermons are ascribed to the wrong authors, and the necessary critical work has not yet been done. The fact therefore that a Creed admirably adapted for opposing Arianism and Sabellianism should have been called the Faith of S. Athanasius, the great champion of orthodoxy against Arianism, is really one which needs no explanation; as no author's name was attached to the *Quicunque* historical imagination would quickly connect it with the name of the great Bishop of Alexandria.

It is at the beginning of the ninth century that it first comes into daylight. By this time it had through its intrinsic merits survived all its rivals. We mentioned above three other Confessions of Faith which belonged to the Western Church. There were others also which we have not mentioned. The use of the *Quicunque* gradually spread on the principle of the survival of the fittest, and owing to its use as a manual of instruction for the clergy it was widely known throughout Spain and Gaul. It was known also in Northern Italy, and commentaries had been written upon it. By this time,

too, we find evidence of its being used in the services of the Church.

But the circumstances of the time were destined to make it still more important. This was the period when the controversy between the East and the West on the doctrine of the Double Procession became prominent, and in the year 809 the Latin monks in the Monastery at Mount Olivet, who were accused of heresy for singing the Nicene Creed with the interpolated words, quoted in support of it a document which they described as the Faith of Athanasius. To be able to quote the words as it was believed of the great Father of Eastern Christianity added abundant strength to their cause, and henceforth the influence of the *Quicunque* in the West became intensified. It was used by Gregory IX. against the Easterns at Constantinople in the thirteenth century; it was used also at the Council of Florence. But though its intrinsic merits, its suitability to the conditions of the time and the name associated with it, gradually made the use of the *Quicunque* universal in the West, it does not seem to have received the technical name of "Symbolum" until the twelfth century. Up till then it had been always called *Fides* or *Sermo* or *Expositio Fidei*, and these names were continued by many theologians right up to the time of the Reformation. On the other hand, the custom gradually prevailed of speaking of the "Three Creeds." The first who did so apparently was Alexander Hales, and the usage became fairly common. We find it, for example, in the popular religious books printed in England just before the Reformation. S. Thomas Aquinas, who accepts the three Creeds, has some little difficulty about the Athanasian. He recognizes that the Creed ought to have the authority of a General Council. What right then had Athanasius to

put forward a Creed in his own name? He had not done so. He had only put forward a sermon or an exposition on the Faith, but the authority of the sovereign pontiff had raised it to the rank of a Creed. Aquinas apparently assumes that some Pope had definitely given authority to the Athanasian Creed. But, as a matter of fact, we believe that there is no document in the Roman Church which gives it the authority that, for example, our Articles do. It is an interesting fact that the final recognition of the Creed by authority was the work of the Reformation. This was natural. Orthodox reformers were anxious to make their orthodoxy on the great questions of the Faith clear, and therefore they accepted the popular terminology of the three Creeds. They dreaded the accusation of Socinianism. We see this tendency in our own Church not only in the importance of the position which it gives to the Athanasian Creed, but also in the Proper Preface and Collect for Trinity Sunday and the dignity given in our Prayer Book to that festival. The "symbolic" authority, then, of the Athanasian Creed was mainly the work of the Reformation.

At the present time the "Athanasian Creed" is accepted in the Roman Church as part of the Catholic tradition, but it does not appear to have any definite authority. Dr. Burn describes its use as follows:

"Thus in the English Church alone has it been made a popular creed, the Roman Church continuing to use it in the office of Prime on Sundays only. Some restriction of that use has resulted from 'the gradual encroachment of the *Sanctorale* upon the *Temporale*, (1) through the multiplication of saints' days, and (2) to a less extent by the raising of the "ritus" or dignity of individual festivals. According to the general rubrics,

if a "festum duplex" fall on an ordinary Sunday, "fit officium de festo, commemoratio de Dominica." How often this occurs depends largely on the particular calendar in use; *e.g.* English Jesuits use the Roman calendar supplemented by the *Proprium Soc. Jesu* and by the *Proprium Angliae*, with the result that hardly a Sunday in the year escapes "occurrence." But occurrence—even with a "duplex"—does not crowd out the Sunday office in the case of the Sundays in Advent and Lent, or of Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima, so the *Quicunque* (with the rest of the Sunday office) survives on these, and (as regards the *Quicunque*) on Trinity Sunday. In the case of the secular clergy there will be fewer cases of occurrence, and the Sunday office is more frequently, or less infrequently, recited.'"[1]

In the Eastern Church it has no authority as a Creed. The following summary by Mr. Ommanney, who is throughout a defender of its use, will be conclusive on that point:

"In the Eastern Orthodox Church it has never been received as a Creed, nor in any of its branches, including of course its most important and vigorous branch, the Russian Church. Nor has it ever been recited in the Offices of the Eastern Church, nor those of any of her branches. The same may be said of the Apostles' Creed. Both these Creeds are Western documents. The Constantinopolitan Creed, of course without the *Filioque* clause—the Nicene so-called—is the Creed said in the Eastern Offices, as in the Eastern Liturgy, viz. at Compline and the Midnight Office. An undue significance has been attached, it must be admitted, sometimes of late to the insertion of our document in the only form in which the Greeks acknowledge it—without the *καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ* in ver. 22—in the Appendix of the modern Greek Horologium, as though proving its reception by the Greek Church, whereas that very position shows that it has no place in the Offices of the Horo-

[1] *An Introduction to the Creeds*, by A. E. Burn, B.D., p. 184.

logium. At the same time, the fact of its being admitted to this position under the express and repeated sanction of the ecclesiastical authorities at Constantinople may be understood apparently to indicate the acceptance and approval of our Creed on the part of the Eastern Church as a doctrinal formula, barring the doctrine of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost. On this point, the marked exclusion of the words 'and of the Son,' especially when considered in connexion with the evident allusion to it in the subjoined note, can only be regarded, I fear, as accentuating the difference between the Eastern and Western Churches. With a similar reservation it is necessary to understand the guarded language of Plato, Archbishop of Moscow, in regard to its use and acceptance by the Russian Church: 'Our Church acknowledges the Symbol of St. Athanasius, and it has a place among ecclesiastical books, we are also enjoined to follow the faith which it teaches, but it is never recited. It is sufficient for us that it contains nothing which is not agreeable with sound and orthodox doctrine.' This must have reference to the Creed only in the text regarded as authentic by Eastern theologians. It is necessary to add that the insertion of it in the Horologium, dating as has been shown above from so recent a period as the latter part of the eighteenth century, can have no significance except as regards the modern Eastern Church." [1]

In most of the reformed Churches the use of it has died out. It is contained in the Irish Prayer Book, but is not directed to be used. It is omitted from the American Prayer Book.

VIII

We have now to return to the two questions of the authority and the value of the *Quicunque*. As to its

[1] *A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed*, by G. D. W. Ommanney, M.A., pp. 457–58.

authority, it must be clearly laid down that in no real sense of the word is it a Catholic Creed. In the sense, of course, of being an exposition or Confession of Faith, it may be called in conventional language a Creed; but then it will share that position with a large number of confessions of faith which have existed in the Christian Church. But the Athanasian Creed has never been accepted as a Creed in the Eastern Church, and has had only the acceptance of usage in the Western. It is, in fact, part of the historical heritage of the Western Church. The use of it in public services has varied at different times in different ways. In its origin it is very similar to the *Te Deum*. Like the *Te Deum* it is a hymn of the Faith; like the *Te Deum* its usage has spread because it was admirably suited for the work of the Church. Unlike the *Te Deum*, it has never received universal acceptance; the *Te Deum*, although never claiming to be a creed, is the great hymn of praise of all branches of the Church. Although Western in origin, it is accepted by the Eastern Church, and probably more than any other document bears witness to the real unity of Christendom. The acceptance of the Athanasian Creed has never been more than partial, and the use of it must depend not on authority, but on its value. Whatever course may be wisest, any particular branch of the Christian Church may decide for itself either to continue the use in its services or to omit it. Its position in our Articles gives its exposition of the Faith authority for us, but it would be within the right of the English Church to omit it from its Articles, which are recognized to be only Articles of Union and not an authoritative exposition of the Faith.

In fact, we may go so far as to say that, if we put the Athanasian Creed forward as a necessary document of the Christian Church and as an oecumenical Creed, we are in

danger of violating the rule of the Church which forbids us to put forward any Creed except that which has the authority of the General Councils. The so-called Nicene Creed in its uninterpolated form is the only document which may in itself be rightly described as an oecumenical Creed, and to consider the Athanasian as of equal authority with that Creed is to violate rather than support Catholic tradition. The special insistence on the Athanasian Creed is a sign of the insularity rather than the Catholicity of the English Church.

The position of the Athanasian Creed in the services of the Church must be justified by its value. There can be no doubt that, as an exposition of the Faith, it sums up in an admirable way the Augustinian theology; but it must be recognized that the language about the Procession is such as the Eastern Church finds it necessary to alter, while the language of the Creed generally has a Western rather than an Eastern sound. The passages, too, which it has been customary to call the "damnatory," and which it is more common now to call the "warning" clauses, raise a further problem. There are no two doctrines which it is more important should be impressed upon our minds at the present day than the reality of the Divine judgement and the necessity of a right belief. Both these doctrines are asserted in the Athanasian Creed; but it is a very solemn question whether or no they are asserted in the manner most likely at the present day to win assent. We wish, above all things, to impress upon people the truth of the statement that God will judge the world, and that men must give account for their works. There is much in modern thought which makes the belief unacceptable. Are we quite sure that the form in which it is put in the Athanasian Creed does not, on the whole, foster this unbelief? To the ordinary reader it appears as if it

stated that a man who does not believe in one of the more obscure propositions of the Creed cannot be saved. Those of us who have thought about the question can accept the language in an historical sense, and can explain it as, for example, Waterland does:

"*This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.*

"This is to be understood, like all other such general propositions, with proper reserves and qualifying constructions. As, for instance, if, after laying down a system of Christian morality, it be said, *This is the Christian practice, which except a man faithfully observe and follow, he cannot be saved*, it would be no more than right and just thus to say: But no one could be supposed hereby to exclude any such merciful abatements or allowances as shall be made for men's particular circumstances, weaknesses, frailties, ignorance, inability, or the like; or for their sincere intentions, and honest desire of knowing and doing the whole will of God; accompanied with a general repentance of their sins, and a firm reliance upon God's mercy, through the sole merits of Christ Jesus. There can be no doubt, however, but that men are accountable for their Faith, as well as for their practice; and especially if they take upon them to instruct and direct others, trusting to their own strength and parts, against the united judgement and verdict of whole Churches, ancient and modern."[1]

This explanation is entirely valid, and it takes away any unreality or insincerity on the part of the clergy who are willing to subscribe to the Creed; but is it right to put forward for the acceptance of the ordinary Churchman a document which requires such an explanation? If we contrast the Athanasian Creed with

[1] *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, by Daniel Waterland, D.D., p. 229.

the wise reticence of the "Nicene," we shall see the difference. That Creed tells us that our Lord Jesus Christ shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, that His kingdom shall have no end; in it we say that we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Here we have the wise reserve of the oecumenical Creed. It emphasizes the two great facts of judgement and eternal life. It does not know more than we can know. It does not take single expressions of the New Testament without the balance of others. If we were to express our own opinion it would be that the Athanasian Creed has a tendency not to strengthen men's belief in the Divine judgement, but to make them doubt, because it suggests that that judgement is not entirely just.

And so as regards the importance of a right belief. To thoughtful persons there is nothing more irrational at the present day than the movement for undogmatic Christianity. Undogmatic Christianity is, of course, an absurdity. Christianity can mean nothing else but the modelling of the whole of our life in accordance with religious belief, a religious belief which must be capable of being put forward as doctrine. All historical and practical experience tells us that ultimately what a man believes or what a nation believes is of transcendent importance. A wrong view of the Christian religion or an abnegation of the Christian Faith will always in the end tell, and tell disastrously, upon life. But we would hazard the opinion that the strange prejudice against dogmatic religion arises largely from the fact that people consider that the (to them) obscure expressions of the Athanasian Creed are what is meant by dogmatic religion.

In a speech at a meeting of the English Church Union, Canon Newbolt alluded to this question:

"What, then, do these clauses mean? Surely they do not mean that every soul at the Last Day will have to give a strict account of his adhesion to terms such as 'incomprehensible,' 'substance,' 'Person,' and the like, which perhaps he does not understand, nor to statements of extreme difficulty, such as the Double Procession of the Holy Ghost, which the Eastern Church rejects as wrong in terms, and as vitiated by its history in the Western Church, but not wrong perhaps in essential doctrine with explanations. Surely we are not to understand that we must literally, actually, and intelligently be able to express our belief in the terms of the Creed as a condition of entering Heaven. Do not these stern clauses rather mean that, the road of salvation being so difficult, it does most emphatically concern us to take the right road? 'Believe, and thou shalt be saved,' is a practical working rule for our everyday life."

Now Canon Newbolt's explanation is one which we all give for ourselves; but it is not the *prima facie* meaning of the words. The ordinary person who reads the Creed gets the impression that it means exactly what it seems to say, and he goes away with the idea that dogmatic Christianity means not a grasp of the great principles of the Christian Faith, but an acceptance of a great deal of technical theological language which is hard to understand and appears to have no relation to practical life. We believe that the Athanasian Creed is a stumbling-block to many persons, and that so far from strengthening the hold of the Christian Faith and the principles of Christianity upon the country, it has the reverse effect. We cannot lay the blame for this upon the stupidity or the indifference of our congregations; for it is the duty of the Church so to put forward the message which it has received that it may commend itself most strongly to even the indifferent, and the unlearned, and the uneducated.

We may sum up now the conclusion to which our historical survey has pointed. We believe that the Athanasian Creed is part of the tradition of the Western Church. As an historical document it is of profound interest, as an exposition of the Faith it is of great value; but its very interest as an historical document means that it is couched in the language of the fifth century, and not in that of the nineteenth or twentieth. It has not, like the 'Nicene' Creed, the note of being oecumenical. It has never received any oecumenical sanction. Its usage in the Church services varies in different branches of the Catholic Church, and may quite well be varied in accordance with the circumstances of the time and national needs. The use of the Creed is the natural result of the historical position of the Church of England. To be induced by the historical position of the Church of England to insist upon its necessity would be a sign not that we were Catholic, but that we confused what was of great historical interest with what was really of Catholic authority. The well-known maxim of S. Vincent cannot in any circumstances apply to the Athanasian Creed.

It is more difficult to say what practical course should be recommended. Let us be quite clear that no re-translation or re-editing is of the very slightest value. That something might be done in this way was an opinion which arose from an imperfect acquaintance with the history of the text. There can be no doubt that in every essential point our English translation of the Creed represents what the Athanasian Creed was in its original form, and gives exactly the meaning that its authors intended it to have. We have also very grave doubt whether any process of mutilation is desirable. It is said that the anathemas have been removed

from the original Nicene Creed. That is not true, as Mr. Turner points out. The real position is that the original Nicene Creed still remains as the authoritative doctrine of the Church, but for use in its services we have another Creed which never had any anathema attached to it at all. We do not ourselves believe in mutilating any historical document; on the other hand, we do not believe that the use of the Athanasian Creed in the services of the Church should continue as at present. The matter is one which requires grave and anxious thought, and we hope that what we have written may suggest that it is one which can be approached on all sides in a spirit of loyalty to Catholic tradition, and that there is no disloyalty in attempting to adapt our forms of worship to the different phases of thought of the centuries as they pass on.[1]

[1] The following opinion of the Bishop of Edinburgh (*Further Studies in the Prayer Book*. By John Dowden, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. London: Methuen, 1908), a sound liturgiologist and Churchman, must be of great value on such a subject as this. He writes:

"As you know, I think the Athanasian Creed, as it now stands in the Prayer Book, is in a high degree ill-suited for use in the large and miscellaneous gatherings that crowd our churches on the great festivals. Indeed, for a large proportion of our own people it is difficult to understand how the *Quicunque*, in its present form, can be other than misleading; and I should hail with satisfaction the adoption by our Church in Provincial Synod of any wisely devised plan (I am not wholly wedded to any particular plan) for the mitigation or removal of the scandal and offence now caused to many devout believers by its use."

The whole paper from which this extract is taken is of very great interest.

V

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES[1]

IN the formation of our religious opinions one of the main elements must always be the predominant religious systems with which we are acquainted. For many it may very likely, for some it must be the case that they never really have the actual experience necessary for even a moderately correct opinion. We are naturally attracted or repelled by what we are acquainted with, or by what is obvious. Now what may be true of individuals in many various ways is, to a certain extent, true on a larger scale of all Western Christians. There are certain facts which are clear, definite and obvious. There is the existence of the Church of Rome, with the claims that it makes. There is the existence of all the varied Protestant bodies, both Continental and English-speaking. There is, for us, the existence of the Anglican Church, which, to some, in its position of a *via media*, may seem to combine the merits of both sides, to many appears as a somewhat amorphous, incoherent body which, because it carries no view to an extreme, seems halting and illogical. Yet these are not the whole facts of

[1] Published in *Church Problems* (London: John Murray, 1900), edited by H. Hensley Henson, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.

Christianity. There is another Church, or rather group of Churches, not very obvious to us in England, almost unknown to the majority, which yet must demand considerable attention from any careful inquirer into the character of Christianity, namely, the Eastern Churches. They are important both for their numbers and for their historical position. Eastern Christianity numbers probably 100,000,000 adherents, and embraces one of the most rapidly increasing races in the world, the Russian; while the Eastern Churches claim, and it is a claim which must at any rate be examined, to preserve unchanged the traditions of the apostolic Church, without any of the violent alterations which have undoubtedly characterized Western Christianity. In examining, therefore, into the credentials and character of Anglicanism, it is reasonable to ask what are the bearings of Eastern Christianity upon its claims, and what are and have been its relations to the Churches of the East.

Eastern Christianity consists of two main divisions—the Orthodox Eastern Church, and the heretical or separated communities. The latter include the Armenians, who have never accepted, and possibly reject, the decisions of the Fourth General Council; the Copts of Egypt, the Jacobites of Northern Syria, and the Abyssinians, all of whom are definitely Monophysite in their creed; and the Nestorians of the mountains north of Mesopotamia, who are the remains of a Church, once large and important, which never accepted the decrees of the Third General Council. None of these bodies are very numerous; they are not remarkable for any great spiritual or theological power; and they are interesting chiefly as historical survivals, perhaps bearing witness in their isolated existence to a period before they separated, namely, to the early part of the fifth century, but by

the very fact of their heresy clearly imperfect in their traditions. We may use their historical evidence, if with some caution; we may sympathize with the tenacity with which they have preserved their creed, in spite of the centuries of persecution to which they have been exposed; we may do all in our power to help them; but to seek direct reunion with them until they are reconciled to the Eastern Church from which they have separated, or, at any rate, until they have cleared themselves from the charge of heresy, would be to violate just those fundamental beliefs which are accepted explicitly or implicitly by all orthodox Christians, Protestant and Catholic alike. We may be impatient at what seem to us now, and perhaps have become in reality, only verbal differences; but such impatience would only be productive ultimately of greater difficulties. It would help to stereotype rather than check division.

The Orthodox Eastern Church is very different. Its size, at any rate, is imposing. It consists of the Four Eastern Patriarchates—Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem; of the autocephalous Church of Cyprus; of the national Churches of free Greece, Servia, Bulgaria,[1] Montenegro, Roumania and Russia; and of 9,000,000 of Orthodox Christians in the Austrian Empire. In creed, in rites, in discipline and traditions all these Churches are almost absolutely identical. Their unity is complete; but owing to differences of history, of tone and temper a broad distinction may be made between the Greek and Russian portions. Most of the Greeks are still subject to Turkish rule; all of them have been; and they have suffered much through misrule, misgovernment and want of liberty. Their Church is Greek in language and character, exhibiting very strongly the characteristics of the nation. The Russian Church is

[1] The so-called Bulgarian schism may for our purpose be ignored.

also national, with all the strength and weakness that that implies, and is deeply influenced by the temperament of the Slavonic race. Whatever may be its faults (and they are certainly not so great as its detractors would have us believe), it has the very strongest hold on the people, and there is no nation in the world so intensely religious as the Russian. Whatever may be the case with a certain number of the upper classes, the vast mass of the people is ardently and, in a way, intelligently attached to their Church. It is the real source of their strength. It has a considerable body of learned theologians; it has produced men of genuinely spiritual life and teaching. Russia and the Russian Church must be one of the most important elements in the religious future of the world.

The theological position of the Eastern Church is, at any rate to itself, clear and definite. Its teaching claims to be that of the undivided Church before the schism which separated East and West, and to preserve pure and unadulterated the traditions and customs of the apostolic age. It formulates this claim in the acceptance of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, the Seven General Councils, and the Seven Sacraments. Its liturgies and other service-books probably give the truest exposition of its real belief, for the *lex orandi* is the *lex credendi*. In addition to these services there are a number of different documents of greater or less degree of authority which have been put forth from time to time. To the seventeenth century belong the *Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Church*,[1] the work of Peter Mogila, and the *Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem and Bethlehem*,[2] held in 1672. Both these belong to the

[1] English translation edited by Overbeck and Robertson. London, 1898.

[2] English translation by J. N. W. B. Robertson. London, 1899. This is from the Greek. The decrees were modified before being published in Russia. See Neale's *Eastern Church, General Introduction*, ii. p. 1173, and Palmer, *Notes on a Visit to the Russian Church*, p. 67.

period when the Church was most under Roman influence, and in some points at any rate are not popular at the present day. More representative, at any rate of the Russian Church, is the *Longer Catechism*,[1] the work of Archbishop Philaret. For the Greek part of the Church there are several catechisms published, the most important that of Kyriakos; but these are not authoritative works. All the Greek documents have a tendency to be more rigid in character. In this essay it is proposed, first of all, to give a short history of the relations between the Greek and English Churches from the time of the Reformation[2]; then to discuss somewhat fully the points of difference between the two Churches. This will lead on to certain general considerations: the importance to the Anglican Church of the existence of the Eastern Church; the lessons and warning that it may give us; the possibility and desirability of reunion. Finally, the general policy which our Church ought to pursue in its relations with the East will be considered.

In the sixteenth century the connexion between the two Churches was very slight. The position of the English Church was built up on a basis of historical knowledge, without any substantial assistance from the attitude or remains of Eastern Christendom. Yet there are some slight traces of its influence in the Prayer Book. The prayer of S. Chrysostom comes directly from the Greek liturgy of that name. Some suffrages in the Litany come directly from the Deacons' Litany. The Invocation in the consecration prayer of the first Prayer Book may perhaps have Oriental affinities. There is

[1] English translation by Blackmore, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church* Aberdeen, 1845. A new one is in preparation.

[2] On this see especially George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century . . . . and the Nonjuring Bishops*, London, 1868; and *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates*, a Lecture by the Bishop of Salisbury.

some reason for thinking that Cranmer possessed and made use of the edition of the Greek liturgy published at Venice in 1528.[1] But all these points are very slight. The English Articles seem to go out of their way to condemn some of the Eastern Churches ; English divines made no use in controversy of Eastern liturgies ; it was their Roman opponents who relied on them. We cannot, in fact, say that a knowledge of the position, the traditions or opinions of the Eastern Church substantially affected the English Church, and it is somewhat remarkable that, whether by historical research or political expediency, it should have obtained a position so much resembling that of the Easterns.

But the Eastern Church, if it had little influence on the formation of the English Church, helped undoubtedly in the creation of our Anglican theology. That the English Church, which was so largely affected by Calvinism in Queen Elizabeth's reign, became Anglican and not Calvinist, is due not only to its formularies and Prayer Book, but also to the learning of its leading clergy. It inherited the sober traditions of Erasmus, Colet, and More, it was strengthened by the support of foreign scholars like Casaubon, and an acquaintance with the history and tenets of the Eastern Church provided its theologians with a strong and clear argument for their main position.

A number of causes combined to bring the Eastern Church before the minds of English scholars in the seventeenth century. During Queen Elizabeth's reign the foundation of the Levant Company was the beginning of our Mediterranean trade. From that time onward we had our ambassador at Constantinople, we had factories at Smyrna and Aleppo, with chaplains who did much good work in studying the religion and

[1] See Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book.*

language of the people around them. English travellers in the East became more numerous. The Roman Church made great efforts at this time to win the East in order to provide something to counterbalance Protestantism, and Constantinople became a scene of ecclesiastical intrigue into which the English ambassador was drawn. Another cause of contact between the two Churches was the personality of Cyril Lucar, from 1602 to 1617 Patriarch of Alexandria, from 1617 to 1638 of Constantinople. A Cretan, more learned than any other member of his Church, he had been educated in the West, and had travelled in Europe, having possibly visited England. He became strongly anti-Roman in his opinions, was anxious to correct some of the faults of his own Church, and laid himself open to the charge of Calvinism. Continuously combating the Jesuit intrigues, he was eventually put to death by the Porte, apparently as a result of their machinations. His confession was published by his enemies after his death, and was condemned by the Eastern Church as clearly Calvinist in a series of synods, ending with that of Bethlehem in 1672, which shew the high-water mark of Roman influence in the East.

The result of these various causes was that the Eastern Church became a very definite fact for English theologians. In 1617 Cyril Lucar sent a certain Metrophanes Critopoulos to study at Oxford, where he was supported at the expense of Archbishop Abbot, and we have our first letter from an Anglican Archbishop to an Eastern Patriarch, a letter sufficiently remarkable to demand quotation. Abbot writes:

"There are many things which testify the sympathy existing between and the sweet agreement enjoyed by members of the Universal Church; but at this time I feel it on this account especially, in that I am enabled

to embrace with both arms your brotherhood, whom I have never seen face to face, though divided from me by many a league of land and sea, as if present; for the unity of faith binds each to each, and the common bond of love joins us by one and the self-same Spirit, by whom we live with Christ whom we both breathe."[1]

The many small points of connexion between the Churches—not all by any means satisfactory—are not worth dwelling on in detail. The Greek student Critopoulos seems to have caused some uneasiness; but he returned home and ultimately became Patriarch of Alexandria. At a somewhat later date we find a certain Nathanael Conopius, Proto-Syncellus of Cyril Lucar, resident in Oxford, who became a Petty Canon of Christ Church,[2] and we find the ambassador complaining of the number of Greeks who desire passports for England. Among Oriental travellers, consuls and chaplains may be mentioned Sandys, Pocock the Orientalist, Rycaut,[3] Smith[4] and Covel,[5] all of whom wrote works on the Greek Church, and a certain Dr. Basire,[6] afterwards Archdeacon of Northumberland, who during the period of the Civil Wars wandered about the Levant with a translation of the Church Catechism into modern Greek, by which he hoped to win the Eastern Patriarchs to the Anglican communion.

The existence of the Greek Church now becomes a main point in the Roman controversy. The orthodoxy of the Greeks is discussed in the conference between

[1] Neale, *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, ii. p. 387.

[2] Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*, p. 657.

[3] *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, 1678.

[4] Tho. Smith, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, *An Account of the Greek Church, as to its Doctrine and Rites*, 1676, 1680.

[5] *Account of the Greek Church*, 1740.

[6] *Correspondence of Isaac Basire, D.D.*, by W. N. Darnell. London, 1831.

Laud and Fisher. When the Church of England definitely claims to be Catholic, the appeal to a Church whose traditional position it was difficult to deny as equally rejecting the claims of the Roman See, becomes of primary importance. As Stillingfleet put it very moderately:

"For it is sufficiently known how much the Greeks agree with us in the opposition to the great point of the Pope's supremacy, and the infallibility of the Church of Rome; how far they are from the belief of Purgatory in your sense, and several other things which are contained in the decrees of the Council of Trent."[1]

Eastern liturgies also had a definite influence. We know that Bishop Andrewes had in his library the service-books of the Eastern Churches; that he prayed in his devotions for the unity of Christendom in language drawn from the Eastern Liturgy, while the Scottish service-book, of 1637, drawn up under the influence of Laud, shews Eastern influences very definitely in the Invocation in the prayer of consecration, which has passed thence to the American Prayer Book.

We may just refer to one curious incident at the close of the seventeenth century. An attempt was made at Gloucester Hall, afterwards Worcester College, to found an institution for the education of Greeks in Oxford. It failed, owing, we are told, to the machinations of the Jesuits, to the difficulty of preserving discipline, and to the bad conduct of some of its members. Ultimately the Patriarch forbade any Greek to study in Oxford.[2]

The eighteenth century, as may be imagined, was not

[1] Stillingfleet, *Works*, vol. iv. p. 481.

[2] See *Union Review*, vol. i. p. 490–500. London, 1863.

one in which the relations between the two Churches would be very close; but for the first time definite approaches for the sake of reunion were made, not by the Church itself, but by the small Nonjuring schism—a body which preserved probably all the prejudices of the English Church. In attempting to open up communications they described themselves as "the Catholic remnant of the British Churches"; they sent a proposal of reunion with a statement of doctrine on the points on which the two Churches differed. The answer of the Eastern Patriarchs, who were much less sympathetic than the Holy Synod of Russia, is a very interesting document, both for its historical statements and for the exhibition it affords of some prominent characteristics of the Eastern Church.

"Our Oriental Church, the immaculate bride of the Lord, has never at any time admitted any novelty, nor will at all allow of any; but observes that saying, 'Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have placed.'

"The Oriental Orthodox Church acknowledges but one Liturgy, the same which was delivered down by the Apostles, but written by the first Bishop of Jerusalem, James the brother of God, and afterwards abbreviated on account of its length by the great Father Basil Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and after that again epitomized by John the golden-tongued Patriarch of Constantinople."

The letters of the Nonjurors were not perhaps in any way distinguished for wisdom, but the replies of the Orientals meet them by the most rigid assertion of doctrine, and shew no intention of yielding a single point. The whole incident was however closed by the matter coming to the ears of Archbishop Wake, who wrote to explain that the persons writing did not

represent the English Church, at the same time expressing very definitely his sympathy with the Eastern Church.

"Meanwhile, we, the true Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, as, in every fundamental article, we profess the same Faith with you, shall not cease, at least in spirit and effect (since otherwise owing to our distance from you we cannot), to hold communion with you, and to pray for your peace and happiness. And I, as I do profess myself most specially bounden to your Holiness, so do I most earnestly entreat you to remember me in your prayers and sacrifices at the Holy Altar of God. And so I bid you farewell in the Lord."[1]

In the year 1772 a work on the Russian Church was published by a certain John King, who had been chaplain at St. Petersburg. It is by far the best work on the Russian Church in English, containing translations of almost all the offices. Most important is the testimony that the author bears to the character of the Russian Church in his day.

"I can say with truth," he writes, "of those with whom I have the honour of personal acquaintance, and I believe in general of the rest, that the superior clergy of Russia at this time are men whose candour, modesty, and truly primitive simplicity of manners would have illustrated the first ages of Christianity." And again: "The many falsehoods and ridiculous stories reported of this Church, and spread over all countries, persuaded me that this is a subject hitherto little known."[2]

In the early part of the nineteenth century the influence of the Church of England in the East was

[1] G. Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, p. lviii. London, 1868.

[2] *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, by John Glen King, pp. xii, xiv. London, 1772.

exercised mainly through the Church Missionary Society. The principles and training of their missionaries would preclude them from having much sympathy with the Churches among which they were working. They would not be likely to make all the necessary allowance for any faults that they might find. But their intention was to work on right lines. They did not intend to make separate communities. "It was thought that the Oriental Churches might be moved to self-reformation, and that, through them, the gospel might be spread among the Mohammedans." The enterprise as a whole failed. Circumstances were not favourable; probably many of the agents had not the necessary sympathy. But individual cases are recorded of good work.

"In the island of Syra the Rev. F. A. Hildner conducted an important school from 1829 to 1876, when old age obliged him to give up his work; but he remained in the island, and on his death in 1883 received great honours, the Greek Cathedral being lent to the Anglican chaplain at Athens for the funeral service, and the Greek Archbishop delivering a touching address to a vast concourse of people."

An interesting mission was started in Egypt. A Mr. Lieder from Basle, an agent of the Society, was its head. Schools were founded at Cairo, and particularly an important Coptic seminary, in which Egyptian boys of the Coptic Church received a scriptural education with a view to their ordination as ministers of that Church. Mr. Lieder remained at his post until his death, although the school had been already given up. He was universally respected. At a later date the Coptic Patriarch referred with commendation to his work, and he received the high encomium of being condemned by Bishop Gobat. "When, however, Bishop

Gobat visited the Mission in 1849 he was of opinion that it was conducted too cautiously, and that Protestant doctrine should be more boldly maintained; and he urged that younger missionaries should be sent out for that purpose." Luckily this was never done; but it is much to be regretted that work well begun should not have been continued by others as devoted as Mr. Lieder, and with full sympathy for the ancient Egyptian Church.

We must give one more extract, as this part of our narrative is important; it is taken from a letter of Mr. Venn to Bishop Blomfield in 1851:

"It has never been the object of the Society to form amongst these Oriental Christians congregations according to the model of the Church of England, as in heathen countries; our object has been, by journeys, by the Press, and by education, to disseminate the knowledge of scriptural truth throughout the country, in order, by God's grace, to raise the tone of Christian doctrine and practice. For this purpose our missionaries have visited persons of all ranks, including many of the highest ecclesiastics; they have distributed the Holy Scriptures and religious books in all languages. We leave to other agencies, under the providence of God, the work of settled pastoral ministrations and parochial education. We rejoice especially whenever a priest of their own communion can be found among them to supply his people with scriptural instruction and pastoral care."

The above narrative and extracts will shew sufficiently well that the Church Missionary Society began their work in the East on principles loyal to the traditions of the Church of England, and not without sympathy and hope for the ancient Eastern Churches.

In 1841 the Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem was founded. It was a well-intentioned scheme; it was

also a very unwise one. It was intended surreptitiously to introduce episcopacy into the Lutheran by a connexion with the English Church, and to bring both Churches into nearer contact with the East. Of the disastrous results it had in England we need not speak; in the East it might have worked very much better, for no Oriental bishop could have considered the presence of an English bishop in Jerusalem in any way undesirable, nor would the presence of the English Church there have worked anything but good, if there had been no members of other Churches drawn away. The purpose in founding the bishopric is stated quite clearly in a letter from Archbishop Howley to the Eastern Patriarchs:

"But that no one may be ignorant why we have sent this Bishop our brother, we make known to you, that we have charged him in no wise and in no matter to invade the jurisdiction of you the Bishops or others bearing rule in the Churches of the East, but rather to show you due honour and reverence, and to be ready, on all occasions and by all means, to cultivate diligently whatever promotes brotherly love, intercourse and unanimity. We are persuaded that this our brother is willing, and will feel himself in conscience bound, to follow these our injunctions: and we beseech you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to receive him as a brother, and to afford him all needful help.

"We are persuaded, brethren, that Your Holinesses will receive this communication as a testimony of our reverence and brotherly love towards you, and of our longing desire to renew that ancient love towards the ancient Churches of the East which has been suspended for ages, which, if restored, by the will and blessing of God, may have the effect of healing the schisms which have brought the most grievous calamities on the Church of Christ."[1]

[1] Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, p. lxii.

Under the first Bishop, Alexander, the policy pursued seems to have been quite legitimate, and his chaplain, George Williams, was more than any one else instrumental in creating in this country an interest in Eastern Christianity. But with the appointment by Prussia in 1846 of Bishop Gobat there was a change. It may be true that, as his defenders state, he did not deliberately proselytize, that he only received those whose conscience would not allow them to remain in their own Church, and it was quite clear that that had been sanctioned by the Archbishop in England; but the real question is whether his teaching had been such as to encourage members of the Eastern Church to be loyal to their own community, and to shew their loyalty by attempting to revive its spiritual life, or whether he had practically made them feel that salvation was not really possible in a body, the corruptness of which had been persistently impressed upon them. A perusal of the Bishop's own writings can, I think, leave no doubt that the latter was his policy. He need not be blamed. He was a sincere and devoted man, acting quite consistently with his convictions. The incident is rather instructive as shewing the unwisdom of artificial alliances between two Churches which do not really agree in teaching, and in explaining the origin of a situation which, as has been shewn, is quite inconsistent with the very steady and continuous policy of the English Church in the East, expressed not only in archiepiscopal utterances, but also in the records of the Church Missionary Society. The congregations of English Christians in the East were for the most part formed, not by the Society, but by Bishop Gobat; it was not the Society but the Bishop who inaugurated the change in policy. These congregations were, after the Bishop's death, taken over by the Society, and they have necessarily kept them going.

Some of their missionaries are more zealous than others, some have better Anglican traditions than others. The policy of the Society is not what the present writer would consider quite correct or ultimately wise, but it is one into which they have drifted, and one from which they are escaping. Their mission in Palestine has been, since 1875, intended to be mainly for Mohammedans, and the work is more and more taking that direction. [1]

These incidents have been dwelt upon at some length in order to bring out that, in spite of a natural want of sympathy, and although their action has not been always the same, the fundamental idea of the Church Missionary Society has been not inconsistent with that which alone can conduce to Christian unity and the spiritual well-being of the East. If we will produce good fruit we must, in a spirit of abnegation, be ready to help the Churches of the East on their own lines. But to imitate the policy of the Roman Church, and to create one more series of separated communities, is simply to weaken Christianity and destroy all reality of religious convictions.

During the past sixty years there has been a considerable amount of interest taken by the English Church in the Eastern, and some by the Eastern in the English. The history of the Eastern Church has been written by Neale and Williams. An Eastern Church Association founded by the latter attracted a considerable number of writers. William Palmer, in his simple-minded search after an ideal Church, which he was fated never to find, drew our attention to Russia. The American Church joined in the movement, and

[1] The above statements and extracts are taken from a pamphlet, *The C.M.S. in Palestine*, published by the Society in 1891, and containing extracts from the *C.M. Intelligencer* of April, 1887, *The C.M.S. Missions in the East*.

appointed a committee of foreign relations. Visits of Englishmen to the East, and visits of Eastern ecclesiastics to England, have helped to increase knowledge, and the letters of the Lambeth Conference have clearly and definitely asserted the claims and desire for friendship of the English Church.[1]

Fresh interest was aroused in the Eastern Church by the Vatican Council of 1870, the promulgation of the Infallibility of the Pope, and the Old Catholic movement on the Continent. This led to the Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875 under the presidency of Dr. Döllinger, in which representatives of the English, Old Catholics and Easterns took part. The conferences made very prominent the ability and the learning of their President, and any result that they had was entirely due to him. In the conference of the first year the whole position was reviewed. The divines who represented the Eastern Church were men of cultivation and learning. They were sincerely anxious to be accommodating, but we may detect in them a characteristic which we may find in that Church even more than elsewhere—it is indeed a failing common to all theologians —the assumption that the basis even of discussion must be the acceptance of their own attitude. At this conference one of the Eastern representatives stated:

"A reunion of the two Churches appears to me to be either very easy or very difficult of accomplishment, according to that which we make the starting-point of our negotiations. It is easy if we make it 'the basis of the undivided Church,' as expressed in the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan creed, the Seven General Councils, and the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments."

Dr. Döllinger immediately pointed out that the Seven

[1] See for example the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury after the first Lambeth Conference in 1867. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. lxv.

Sacraments were not mentioned in the decrees of the Seven General Councils. The reply was that although that was so, and the number seven was not formally used, that substantially this summed up the teaching of the undivided Church, and it was stated that "the three points I have mentioned must be insisted upon unconditionally."[1] Dr. Döllinger by his remark brought out the whole weakness of this position. If it is admitted that the insistence on Seven Sacraments is not a doctrine of the undivided Church, and it is quite clear that it was not, then, however valid the rest of the argument may be, the question must be open to discussion. But the Eastern theologian is only too much addicted to supplementing his appeal to an undivided Church by the assumption that his interpretation of that Church is absolutely correct. It is a fault that he shares with many other theologians; perhaps certain circumstances make him do it more uncompromisingly than some others, but until the habit ceases on all sides conferences for reunion will be quite unavailing.

The second conference in 1875 discussed the *Filioque*, and succeeded in arriving at certain definite conclusions. The addition to the creed was pronounced irregular, and the doctrine of the *Procession* was formulated in the following series of propositions drawn from the works of John of Damascus and accepted by both sides as a sufficient statement. The references to the writings of the Father are omitted in what follows[2]:

"1. We agree in accepting the Œcumenical Creeds and the dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

[1] *Report of the Bonn Conference of* 1874, p. 33. London, 1875.

[2] *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference held at Bonn between the* 10*th and* 16*th of August*, 1875. Translated from the German of Professor Reusch, with a Preface by H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's. London, 1876.

2. We agree in admitting that the addition of the *Filioque* to the symbolum was not made in a canonical manner.

3. We adhere on all sides to the form of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is taught by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

4. We reject every notice and every mode of expression in which in any way the acceptance of two Principles, or ἀρχαὶ, or αἰτίαι, in the Trinity, would be involved.

5. We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, and expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the ancient undivided Church:—

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός) as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the cause (αἰτία), the source (πηγή) of the Godhead.

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), because in the Godhead there is but one beginning (ἀρχή), one cause (αἰτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son.

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father, issuing out of the Father, and resting in the Son, as the power radiating from Him.

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of the Deity, and utters the word.

6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is united to the Father through the Son."

Since this time there have been many interchanges of courtesy between the two communities, but nothing definite has been accomplished. Meanwhile political developements have done a good deal to bring England into contact with the East. We have become respon-

sible for the government of Cyprus and Egypt; we have had much to do with Greece. On the other hand, political rivalry has a tendency to hamper relations with Russia. Yet something has been accomplished. The Archbishop's Mission to the Assyrian Christians has been a noble attempt to help unselfishly an ancient body of Christians sadly needing assistance. Various books have been published illustrating the history, the liturgies and the present position of the two Churches. The Jerusalem Bishopric has been revived on a broader basis, in accordance with the wish and desire of the Greek Patriarch; and the consecration of the new English church at Jerusalem, in its architecture and services typically Anglican, one of the most beautiful buildings in Jerusalem, has put forward clearly and well the true Anglican position.

While there is this tradition of friendliness on the part of the English Church to the East, we ask naturally, What is the attitude of the East to us? The answer must be that there are there as here two parties. There are those who are friendly to us, and those who are the reverse. There are those who have some knowledge, and those who are ignorant. There are those who judge by such action of ours as seems to be most typical, and there are those who have not unnaturally been prejudiced against us. There are those who minimize, and those who exaggerate, the differences between the two Churches.

It is, in the first place, well known that the Church of England definitely claims an historical position very different from that of Protestantism, and that the greater number of its members demand recognition on this basis. We are recognized as an ally in the controversy with Rome, for the Eastern Church is strongly, often too strongly, anti-Roman, and exhibits sometimes a strange

nervousness which makes it reluctant to recognize what Rome may not endorse. Any approaches to friendship are almost invariably—unless some turn in the very crooked politics of the East intervene—received in the same spirit. The distinction given to the Archbishop of Finland in this country is no greater than that given to the Bishop of Peterborough or the Archbishop of York in Russia. There is also a very strong disposition on the part of many Russian theologians to recognize, or almost to recognize, our Orders, but they are always a little afraid of committing themselves.[1] There is a great disposition for friendliness.

On the other hand, instances might be quoted of unfriendliness, suspicion, and ignorance. There have been something very like attempts to build up a Russian Church in America; there have been quite unnecessary and unreasonable cases of vilification; there are naturally movements and public utterances in this country which reasonably or unreasonably cause suspicion. We have many enemies who say what they can against us, and political feeling will often shew itself in theological rancour. And then behind all there is a fact to which we shall have to refer more fully later—that intense conservatism which a large number of circumstances have combined to produce in the Eastern Church, and which have made it, at any rate in appearance and feeling, one of the most unmoveable of Christian communities.

The above historical survey will have brought out a very clear and definite line of policy on the part of the English Church. It has again and again during these centuries expressed its desire for friendship—a friendship

[1] See particularly *The Question of Anglican Orders*, by A. Bulgakoff. Translated by W. J. Birkbeck; published by the Church Historical Society, No. lv., 1899.

which might lead to reunion—and it has felt that the existence of the Eastern Church is a strong support its own historical claims and position. The attitude of the Eastern Church has become increasingly friendly, but any movement for more than friendship on our part finds itself opposed to the uncompromising character of Oriental theology. At the same time there is a party in each whose tendency is to unfriendliness and even hostility. The grounds of friendship are the similarity of theological position, the causes of hostility partly certain theological difficulties, still more very obvious and deep-reaching dissimilarity of temperament and character. The next step in the investigation must be an inquiry into the main points of divergence between the two Churches.

Broadly speaking, both Churches appeal to Scripture and tradition, but the English Church asserts more definitely and strongly than the Eastern the sufficiency of Scripture for salvation, and the comparative indifference of the rites and ceremonies which cannot be definitely proved by it. Yet the difference is largely one of practice. If we take the *Longer Catechism* of the Russian Church we shall find little to object to. Revelation it tells us spread everywhere by two channels—Holy Tradition and Holy Scripture. Tradition is the older, because Jesus Christ delivered His Divine doctrine by word and example, not by writing; and the same method was followed by His apostles. "Scripture was given that Divine revelation might be preserved more exactly and unchangeably." "We must follow that tradition which agrees with the Divine revelation and with Holy Scripture"; but tradition is necessary "as a guide to the right understanding of Holy Scripture, for the right ministration of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity

of their original institution." So far generally we might agree, but the difference of attitude is really this. The Church of England has had to correct what it believed to be a corrupt tradition which had gradually grown up. It recognized, then, that only what could be proved by the oldest Christian documents handed down by the Church as inspired records of revelation could be held as necessary for salvation. But the events of the Reformation proved that Scripture was an uncertain guide, and led people into many strange places. It was quite clear to the historical student that a tradition must be older than the books of the Bible, and that the form and direction of Christian theology was older than any written record, and was imposed upon it by tradition. It was also clear that the earlier rites and ceremonies of the Church which represented an early and continuous tradition should not be departed from. But it was only too obvious that traditions had not been handed down in their original purity; it was necessary, therefore, to test traditions by the appeal to Scripture, by the appeal to history, and the appeal to the traditions of other Churches. The English Church appeals therefore to tradition and the undivided Church, but it is always with a sense of investigation. It believes that substantially its teaching does represent a true and primitive position, but its history has warned it to be careful.

The Eastern Church has not changed in the same violent way, it has never had to investigate, it always has defended and asserted. It appeals, therefore, to the undivided Church, but it asserts that its teaching is the teaching of the undivided Church, that its traditions are the true ones. It has never learnt to be wary of the slow and imperceptible changes which gradually creep over any society and transform—it may be for the better, it may be for the worse—all its teaching and life.

There is, then, this fundamental resemblance. Both alike appeal to Scripture and tradition, or (to formulate it more definitely) to Scripture and the undivided Church. And this they do very clearly and definitely in opposition to Romanism and as a corrective of the vagaries of an unhistorical Protestantism. Speaking broadly, in their Creed and their Church Order the bodies would agree; but there is a difference in the fact that practically the Eastern Church lays a far greater stress upon tradition, and is very clearly confident that it possesses a true tradition.

When we pass to details the first point is that of the creed. We should hold, with the Eastern Church, that the standard of faith should be the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which in our communion service is called the Nicene Creed. So far we are agreed; but unfortunately when we examine it, the text of the creed as we use it is found to differ from that they use. The Easterns recite, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from the Father": the English Church, however, with the rest of Western Christendom, says, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son." The point at issue is twofold. In the first place, it is contended that whether the addition was correct or not, it was made in an irregular way; in the second place it is contended by the Eastern Church that the doctrine implied is erroneous, because it would assert two ἀρχαὶ or sources in the Godhead. On the first point the Eastern Church is absolutely right. *Filioque* was added through a blunder by a provincial council at Toledo, and ultimately adopted simply on the authority of the Pope. The Council of Chalcedon, which finally promulgated the creed in the form in which it had been previously accepted, had also pronounced an anathema on any who should add to it. The addition, which has

probably been a sign rather than a cause of the division between East and West, is, as was confessed at the Bonn Conference, irregular. An attempt has been made to define a point which the Church has never defined, which it will probably seem to most people very unnecessary that it should define. As to the irregularity of the addition, the error must definitely be admitted. It is another thing to condemn the West for heresy. It is characteristic of the Eastern mind not to be content with that concession, but to feel it a duty to condemn the implied heresy which the words contain. But the point has never been defined by the Church, nor is there any reason that it should be. If the Eastern Church continue to insist on condemning not the addition but the implied teaching of the West, they are really implicitly guilty of doing what the Council condemns, of adding to the necessary articles of the Christian faith. The point has not been defined: it does not touch on any of the vital points of the Christian religion. We may let it alone.

It is sometimes forgotten that one of the main purposes of the appeal to antiquity is that antiquity did not burden the creed with unnecessary definitions. It condemned all who did so. But if we impose on others a dogmatic position and define new points, if we condemn those who differ on some point outside the creed, if we condemn for an inferential heresy those who are quite willing to accept the creed, we are quite as much untrue to the primitive Church as if we added new clauses. The doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost may be legitimate subject for theological speculation and pious opinion, but for us to seek to impose our opinion on the Greeks, or the Greeks theirs on us, is quite unnecessary. Where the Church has not defined, there the Church may differ.

A second point of difference is the sacraments. The

Eastern Church declares somewhat vehemently that it is the Church of the Seven Sacraments; the English Church says that there are two sacraments only instituted by our Lord, and necessary for salvation. When we come to examine more closely we find, however, that the difference is not so great as appears. The Eastern would place the two sacraments on a different level from the rest; the English admits other rites, and occasionally calls them by the name of sacraments, the only one of the seven that it has not retained being unction. The number of seven sacraments has been referred to above. It is far later than the division of East and West; it is a Western doctrine which has crept into the East. The Eastern Church has built up its own system, very likely an admirable one, upon this basis. It is not our business to be too ready to condemn them; but so long as they appeal to the undivided Church with one breath, and with the next assert teaching as necessary which is clearly later in its dogmatic form and has no conciliar authority, and say that this question is not a subject for discussion, so long conferences are useless. The English Church may be wrong, but its error must be proved.

The same may be said about the use of the word *μετουσίωσις*, or transubstantiation. It is clearly part of normal teaching of the Eastern Church. A very acute observer writes:

"I think there is an impression among us that *μετουσίωσις* is not a word in common use, but is rather esoteric. Whether or not it is absolutely synonymous with 'transubstantiation' may perhaps be open to question. But, however that may be, it is the common popular word, used in catechisms and ordinary books of instruction."

In Russia, also, we find the word used in the

declaration of faith made by every bishop at his consecration :

"Further, I do believe and understand that the *transubstantiation* of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is made, as the Eastern and Ancient Russian Churches teach, by the influence of the Holy Ghost." [1]

There is a large party in the Russian Church which contends that this is clearly not the same as the Roman *transubstantiation*. There are many who probably would be glad to get rid of the word. There is another party whose aim would be to emphasize the resemblance to Rome. But here again, on the very presumption of the Eastern Church, there is a previous question. To give any sort of authority to the word is to violate the appeal to the undivided Church. The word was not used in this connexion in Eastern theology until the twelfth century. It was introduced from a Roman source. It is quite clearly no part of the traditions of Christianity. Any insistence on the word or doctrine is untrue to the principles of the Eastern Church. The expression of sacramental belief should be not a dogma, but a service. The undivided Church has embodied its sacramental worship in a series of liturgies, varying in character, yet modelled on a common structure, and testifying to a definite tradition. Our appeal should be from dogma to liturgy, from theology to worship. The possession of a liturgy adequately representing the sacramental ideals of the early Church is a reasonable demand. If all Churches, Eastern and Western, Roman and Anglican, were content with the sacramental expression of their liturgies, the reunion of Christendom would soon be far nearer than seems possible now.

[1] King, *op. cit.* p. 96.

The Eastern Church also asserts that it is the Church of the Seven Councils. It is, as always, perfectly confident. There are seven General Councils, and no more. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 states:

"In conformity with the practice of the former Conferences we declare that we are united under our Divine Head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed Oecumenical Councils."

The whole question is, What are the undisputed Councils? There could be, I imagine, no doubt that the English Church accepts the first six, although it may lay (very naturally) greater stress on the first four. Its first synodical act under Archbishop Theodore was to accept the six councils, and it would be very unwise on any principle of continuity not to recognize this. But what about the seventh? The Eastern theologian is very fond of saying, "If you object to the Second Council of Nicaea, how do we know that you may not some day refuse to accept the first?" This is just one of those question-begging sayings which people who assume as axiomatic what they ought to prove are very fond of. The real question at issue of course is—Is the Seventh Council Oecumenical? Has it been universally accepted? It is undoubted that immediately after it met it was condemned by the Council of Frankfort, at which the English Church was represented, and, so far as I am aware, no English synod has ever accepted it. It was ultimately accepted in the East; in the West it had to wait for its formal acceptance until the Council of Florence, and it has several times been condemned by both East and West. When the acceptance is not

clear it seems reasonable to demand that the matter should be a subject of discussion, and not that it should be dogmatically settled.

The decree of the Council is at any rate part of the teaching of the Eastern Church, and a study of it will shew what is considered *de fide* on the nature of Icons. The Council begins by expressing its adherence to the decrees of the first six Councils ; it then goes on :

"And, to be brief, we affirm that we preserve all the traditions of the Church which have been handed down to us in her, whether written or unwritten, without innovation : of which one is the formation of representative images, as being perfectly concordant with the history of the Evangelical preaching, and helping to establish that the incarnation is real and not imaginary, and conducing no less to edification than the other. For those things which are mutually illustrative of each other have undoubtedly the same power of representation.

"These things, therefore, being so ; as proceeding in the royal road and following the sacred doctrine of our holy fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church—for this we acknowledge to be from the Divine Spirit that dwelleth in her—we, with all exactness and care, do define that, in the same manner as the holy and life-giving Cross, so shall holy images, whether formed of colours or of stones, or any other material, be set forth in all the holy churches of God, and also on sacred vessels and garments, on walls and on doors, in houses and by the highways—whether images of Christ Jesus our Lord, our God and Saviour, or of our immaculate Mistress the Holy Mother of God, or of the holy Angels, or of the Saints and other holy men. For, in proportion as these are continually seen in images and pictures, so are the minds of the beholders aroused to the remembrance of and affection for their prototypes.

"And, further, we define that there be paid to them the worship of salutation and honour, and not that true

worship which is according to faith and which belongs to God alone. And in the same way as to the holy Cross or the sacred Gospels—so to these also shall be made offerings of light and incense, as was the pious custom of those of old. For the honour of the image passes on to the prototype, and he who worships an image worships in it the person who is represented thereby. Thus is confirmed the doctrine of the fathers —thus the tradition of the Church which in every place hath received the Gospel. Thus we follow Paul speaking in Christ and the whole company of the Apostles and Fathers, holding fast the traditions which we have received. Thus we write in the hymns which spake in prophecy of the Church, 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout, O daughter of Israel: be glad and rejoice with all thine heart. The Lord hath taken away (the wickedness of thine enemies): He hath redeemed thee from the hand of thine adversaries. The Lord thy King is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more, and peace shall be upon thee for ever' (Zeph. iii. 14).

"Those who dare to teach or think otherwise, or after the manner of accursed Heretics to reject ecclesiastical tradition, or to imagine any innovations, or to cast out any of those things which have been brought into the Church—whether it be the Gospel, the type of the Cross, or any picture, or any relic of a martyr; or to reason perversely or craftily for the subversion of any of the legitimate traditions of the Church, or to use any of the precious things or of the sacred monasteries as profane things: if they be Bishops or Clergy let them be deposed; or if Monks or Laics, let them be separated from Communion."[1]

This decree is very carefully drawn, for the Council was perfectly aware that the reverence for images was open to the charge of idolatry. The reference at

[1] I have used the translation in Mendham's *History of the Seventh General Council*, making one or two alterations.

the beginning to the Incarnation is difficult, but it really means that our Lord having appeared in the flesh, it was legitimate to make a representation of Him. The Eastern Church was afraid of any representation of the Father, the Trinity or the Spirit; but to Christ incarnate this prohibition could not apply: if we represent our Lord's human body, we imply that we believe truly in His Incarnation. Pictures then are to be allowed of the Second Person of the Trinity, of the Virgin, of Angels and Saints. The essential point is that pictures teach and edify. Further, reverence may be paid them, but not worship; such it is explained as is paid to the Cross, or to the Gospels, and this reverence is merely relative. The sight of the picture or cross creates a resemblance of what it represents, and so makes us think of and reverence that. It may be very doubtful whether this decree admits or allows more than the natural feelings which we should all hold to be legitimate in Art. We should all defend the use of religious pictures as a means of instruction, and as stirring in us feelings of reverence, and referring us back to the ideas and thoughts implied in the subject or type. Reverence by means of candles and incense was a form of reverence which might be paid even to men: a bishop or an emperor might be reverenced and incensed. These were the customs of the day. All that the decree means is that real reverence is not idolatry. It does not make the use of incense and lights in any way necessary or obligatory.

Iconoclasm meant, it must be remembered definitely, iconoclasm. It began, no doubt, as a natural and legitimate protest against the very superstitious customs that prevailed. It began in moderation, but it had become a determined attack upon all Art in religion. It was largely justified by the excess of image-worship,

but had it succeeded it would have banished Art from the Christian Church. It is quite true that, under the shadow of this decree, much that is superstitious and cannot be distinguished from idolatry has found a home. But many Easterns regret and have attempted to check this. We are not concerned to defend the common practice; we are concerned with the decree, and that does not compel us to accept anything except what all Christians who make use of Art in worship would allow.

This same view is also clearly supported by the official teaching of the Russian Church. The use of Icons would, it is said, be idolatrous only "if we were to make gods of them": but "it is not in the least contrary to the Second Commandment to honour Icons as sacred representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's work and of His Saints; for when thus used Icons are books, written with the form of persons or things instead of letters."

Another very definite point of difference is the Invocation of Saints. "It must be frankly recognized that there is very little, if any, formal difference between Russian and Orthodox practice in this respect." That is true as to practice; it is not, I think, true as to theory. The Eastern Church does not believe in the merit of the Saints, but prays for them as they are themselves only saved by grace. It asks for the prayers of the departed as it asks for the prayers of the living, believing that they are cognisant of our prayers, and that they join with us in the great offering of prayer which the Church on earth and the Church in heaven pour forth before the throne of God. So the invocation is not confined to those technically known as Saints, but any of the departed are asked to join in our prayers. The child asks its departed mother to pray for it, and

the following poem represents a father asking his departed children to pray for him:

"Dear children, at that same still midnight do ye,
As I once prayed for you, now in turn pray for me;
Me who loved well the Cross on your foreheads to trace;
Now commend me in turn to the mercy and grace
Of our gracious and merciful God."[1]

Since it is only fair in this subject, as in the kindred subject of prayers for the dead, to allow the most rational writers of a Church to speak for it, the following extract from the writer Khomiakoff, whom we have already quoted, is given:

"We know that when any one of us falls, he falls alone; but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all her other members.

"If any one believes, he is in the communion of faith; if he loves, he is in the communion of love; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope on his own prayers, and every one who prays asks the whole Church for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurance that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the angels pray for us, the apostles, martyrs and patriarchs, and, above them all, the Mother of our Lord, and this holy unity is the true life of the Church.

"But if the Church, visible and invisible, prays without ceasing, why do we ask her for her prayers? Do we not entreat mercy of God and Christ, although His mercy preventeth our prayer? The very reason that we ask the Church for her prayers is that we know that she gives the assistance of her intercession even to him that does not ask for it, and to him that asks she gives it in far greater measure than he asks: for

[1] Khomiakoff, in Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, i. p. 2.

in her is the fulness of the Spirit of God. Thus we glorify all whom God has glorified and is glorifying; for how should we say that Christ is living within us, if we do not make ourselves like unto Christ? Wherefore we glorify the Saints, the Angels, and the Prophets, and, more than all, the most pure Mother of the Lord Jesus, not acknowledging her either to have been conceived without sin, or to have been perfect (for Christ alone is without sin and perfect), but remembering that the pre-eminence, passing all understanding, which she has above all God's creatures, was borne witness to by the Angel and by Elizabeth, and, above all, by the Saviour Himself, when He appointed John, His great Apostle and seer of mysteries, to fulfil the duties of a son and to serve her.

"Just as each of us requires prayers from all, so each person owes his prayers on behalf of all, the living and the dead, and even those who are as yet unborn: for in praying, as we do with all the Church, that the world may come to the knowledge of God, we pray not only for the present generation, but for those whom God will hereafter call into life. We pray for the living that the grace of God may be upon them, and for the dead that they may become worthy of the vision of God's face. We know nothing of an intermediate state of souls, which have neither been received into the kingdom of God, nor condemned to torture, for of such a state we have received no teaching, either from the Apostles or from Christ. We do not acknowledge Purgatory, that is, the purification of souls by sufferings from which they may be redeemed by their own works or those of others: for the Church knows nothing of salvation by outward means, nor any sufferings whatever they may be, except those of Christ; nor of bargaining with God, as in the case of a man buying himself off by good works."

We have sufficiently in the preceding pages compared the teaching of the two Churches. Such discussion is always tedious and always necessary. So long as

Churches differ, or have inherited differences, we cannot evade the problems thus created ; we have no right to save ourselves the trouble of minute and careful thought or investigation, even although the points may seem trivial, and the subject one which might have been avoided. Carelessness in theology, indifference to detail, indolence, a fear of exactness, do not harmonize, and never have harmonized, differences ; they only create them. The theologian who is really liberal will never be contemptuous of any subject which has divided human thought, although he may prove his ability by shewing how near the reconciliation is.

But the difficulty of reunion does not really lie in these separate theological points, although they will have to be solved, but in differences of tone and temper, above all, in the whole attitude of mind exhibited by the Eastern Church. Whether in Greece or in Russia, the Eastern Church has for centuries had long periods of isolation from the rest of Christendom. Its history, compared with that of the West, has been much more uniform. There has been no great developement like Scholasticism, no great and violent change like the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation. It has really changed considerably, but the change has been slow and gradual, and so it has not been conscious of it. As a result of this, the ordinary attitude of the Oriental Church—more than that of any other—is to look upon itself as perfect, to assert that its rites and teaching have been absolutely unchanged since the apostolic times, and to demand absolute submission as a necessary condition of reunion. This has been illustrated for the eighteenth century in some extracts given above from the letters of the Patriarchs to the Nonjurors ; but if it is said that these extraordinary statements represent a period of ignorance, we can almost parallel them from the Encyclical

Letter of the Eastern Patriarchs in answer to Pius IX., where it is said that every one must agree "how impious and antisynodal it is to attempt the alteration of our doctrines and liturgies and other Divine offices, *which are, and are proved to be, coeval with the preaching of Christianity.*" And Khomiakoff, who represents the most conciliatory spirit of his Church, writes as follows:

"The Spirit of God, who lives in the Church, ruling her and making her wise, manifests Himself within her in divers manners; in Scripture, in Tradition and in Works; for the Church, which does the works of God, is the same Church which preserves tradition and which has written the Scriptures. Neither individuals, nor a multitude of individuals within the Church, preserve tradition or write the Scriptures; but the Spirit of God, which lives in the whole body of the Church. Therefore it is neither right nor possible to look for the grounds of tradition in the Scripture, nor for the proof of Scripture in tradition, nor for the warrant of Scripture or tradition in works. To a man living outside the Church neither her Scripture nor her tradition nor her works are comprehensible. But to a man who lives within the Church and is united to the spirit of the Church, their unity is manifest by the grace which lives within her."[1]

The position represented here is quite clear and intelligible. It is, You must accept us and our Church, and look on its teaching as correct: if you do, you will have no difficulties; if you do not, you cannot understand us. The position is intelligible. It is perfectly natural to those who, growing up in their own Church, have always accepted it; but it offers no help to outside. It has often been said that you cannot understand a religion until you have seen it from within, and that there can be no real union until there is unity of life. You cannot amalgamate two Churches by sitting down

[1] *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. p. 198.

and arranging their doctrines. But underlying the whole of the extract given the assumption is made by the author that his Church is absolutely right. We have no difficulty about the relative authority of Scripture and tradition, if we are firmly convinced beforehand that the tradition of our Church is absolutely true, and that Scripture must agree with it, and therefore can always be interpreted as doing so. Yet there is another attitude of mind, one which necessarily arises in every thoughtful person, who looks not at one but at all the different branches of the Christian Church. He finds that there are many traditions; he finds that there are very different interpretations of Scripture; he is quite clear that every Church has changed, one in one way, one in another. To such a man these strong and dogmatic assertions are mere empty words. He has studied the history of liturgies, and knows that there has been a continuous if slow change. He knows perfectly well how the Eastern Church was influenced by the Roman in the seventeenth century, and that in that way came the Acts of the Synod of Bethlehem and the Orthodox Confession; he knows how that influence has left its mark on the services. He knows how there has been a change in the temper and character of the Church since then. He can trace in the East, as well as in the West, change. He cannot accept the statements and assertions and traditions of the East alone. He may value them highly, he may believe that they are often sound and healthy, but he cannot help comparing and criticizing, and exaggerated dogmatic statements only annoy him.

This attitude of the Eastern Church is, and will be until it is changed, the greatest hindrance to reunion. It thinks and says that it has never changed. It says that the Church is infallible, and thinks that it is the Church.

Until it will approach the points of difference between it and other communions in a different spirit—unless it is prepared, if necessary, to admit that it has been wrong, and that the Church of God is a far greater and wider body than its own community, and that God's Spirit has worked and worked with force and power in a far wider sphere, all real progress, anything beyond friendly intercourse (and for every act of friendship between Christian bodies we should be thankful), must be impossible.

Yet the existence of the Eastern Church is a very significant fact. It is, in the first place, a strong support of the position of the English Church. The Church of England has in the West the strength, but also the weakness, of its position as a *via media*. It seems to many a very unreal compromise. It claims to be something different from the Protestant Churches, yet it is not Roman. Its position has been gained by a process which appears somewhat artificial. It is true that it can appeal to a long line of learned men, both its own and those attracted from other countries. The result of modern discovery does not make us in the least inclined to distrust our position. But certainly in the West we are isolated. It is then a great gain to appeal to a Church whose claim to Catholicity, to an historical position, cannot be doubted, and which on the fundamental point is decisively on the side of the English Church. The point is (we may omit details), the acceptance of a position which implies the appeal to historical Christianity, which best preserves the traditions and Order of the Primitive Church, but denies absolutely the supremacy, the authority and the infallibility of Rome. As against Rome, the East is far more vigorous and assertive than we are; its controversy is not always wise or charitable, but both its position and its claims to that position are clear and decisive. On the other hand,

in preserving the traditions of the Primitive Church on questions of order, organization, liturgical worship, it again takes the same line and attitude as the Church of England does, and that either against Rome or against what is commonly called Protestantism. There are differences. No attempt has been made to minimize or deny them in this essay. They are by no means unimportant. On some points one Church may be right, on some points the other. The Church of England has sufficient warning to caution it against any claims to infallibility. But, compared with the points of difference, the points of agreement are far greater and more important. The agreement is one of logical position; the differences lie in the interpretation of that position. We need not press the agreement further than it will go, but we cannot be blind to its significance.

And not only have we the support of the Orthodox Church; we have also indirectly the support of the separated communities. For although they are heretical (yet the extent of their heresies may in some cases be doubted), they have a definite value as historical witnesses. They witness, for the most part, to a time before they separated. They may have been, to a certain extent, influenced since that time by one another, or by the Orthodox Church, but for the most part the relations have been those of isolation, even occasionally of repulsion. The points therefore of their agreement are of great weight; the points on which they differ, not as the result of their teaching, are equally instructive. And again, in the main lines of controversy we have the support of their historical evidence.

It is always difficult to know how arguments appeal to different minds, but to the present writer the argument against the claims of Rome, drawn from the history, the

position and the existence of the Eastern Church, seems decisive.

But there is another direction in which the Eastern Church seems to suggest a support to our position. We claim above all to be a National Church. That does not mean an adherence merely to some particular form of establishment. It means that, in its history and life, the Church is, or should be, bound up with the life of the nation, and that a National Church, while holding to all that is essential to Christian unity, may reasonably and rightly develope its own national customs—that its language should be the language of the people, that its customs and worship should correspond with the genius of the people. Christianity is so much deeper than any human expressions of it, that there will be a nearer approach to truth gained by each nation and people interpreting the message for themselves. We do not want a Procrustean system imposed upon all people alike. Now Eastern Christendom is the home of National Churches, and of National Churches which have played a great part in their national life. There are many criticisms, many just criticisms, which may be made on the Churches of the East, but it must never be forgotten that through all the dark period of Turkish rule it was the Church which preserved the national life, and that inspired the movement for freedom. Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, Greece can all testify to this, and the only danger to nationalism has arisen when the Greeks of the Phanar have attempted by means of Turkish rule to transform the Holy Eastern Church into the Greek Church. But all evidence makes it clear that the national principle is the stronger; that it will be strong enough to stand against Russian as against Greek imperialism. The Russian Church, too, is essentially a national Church, bound up with the national life, and

responding to the national spirit and character. The danger for the future is that the national Church may become an imperial Church, suppressing elsewhere as in Georgia national life. For Russia does not appear to understand the principle of a self-governing colony, or of unity in diversity.

The Eastern Church can also give us valuable instruction. This lies, not in one particular point, but in the fact that it offers a very definite and distinct type of Christianity. A Russian writer, whom we have already often quoted, tells us that the whole of the West is under Roman influence. Our doctrines are Roman, or developed in opposition to Rome:

"All the Western doctrine is born out of Romanism; it feels (though unconsciously) its solidarity with the past; it feels its dependence from one science, from one creed, from one line of life; and that creed, that science, that life was the Latin one. This is what I hinted at, and what you understand very rightly, viz., that all Protestants are Crypto-Papists; and indeed it would be a very easy task to show that in their Theology (as well as philosophy) all the definitions of all the objects of creed or understanding are merely taken out of the old Latin System, though often negatived in the application. In short, if it was to be expressed in the concise language of algebra, all the West knows but one datum, '*a*'; whether it be preceded by the positive sign '+,' as with the Romanists, or with the negative '−,' as with the Protestants, the '*a*' remains the same."[1]

This is, of course, very largely true. All our Western theology is coloured by the influence of the Middle Ages. Mediaeval Scholasticism was succeeded by Protestant Scholasticism. The Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith, the Zwinglian doctrine of the Sacraments, both arose out of opposition to the current

[1] Khomiakoff, ap. Birkbeck, *op. cit.* i. p. 67.

Roman views. A whole series of questions which have never been raised at all in the East are discussed in the West. The controversies about works and faith, about Scripture and tradition, are not understood. It is not of course maintained for a moment that this difference between the East and West is altogether to the advantage of the East. The East suffers lamentably from a want of grasp of man's individuality, from a very slight realization of sin, from an inadequate realization of the Atonement. But if the East might learn much from the West, the West may also learn from the East. A correction to the rigid and mechanical theories of priesthood, which are sometimes held and always attacked among us, may be cited. There is no doubt a strong tendency among us to exaggerate the individual act of the priest, to suggest that it is the priest who performs Sacraments, the priest who gives the Holy Spirit, the priest who absolves. But the East reminds us that the priest is, after all, only the organ of the Church. "The Seven Sacraments are in reality not accomplished by any single individual who is worthy of the mercy of God, but by the whole Church in the person of an individual, even though he be unworthy." And this is illustrated in all its services. In the baptismal service it is, "M. or N. is baptized in the name of the Father," etc. Ordination is always by prayer. The ordinary form of absolution was always until the seventeenth century, and is still for the most part, a prayer. The Coptic office may afford another illustration, where the people, by responding all through the prayer of consecration, are associated definitely with the act of the priest. All these instances bring home to us how inclined we have been to exaggerate, whether in defence or attack, the office of the priest. A number of different elements

have combined to direct our attention to this point in England. A more healthy and less exaggerated tone has crept over a great deal of our theology. Some of the most thoughtful and best of recent writings have brought out more and more for us the idea of the Church, instead of the idea of the priesthood, or rather the conception of the priest as the organ of the Church. It is certainly interesting to find that this is the normal theory implied in the traditions and services of the East. Here, as in other cases, we find that there is a third alternative between a mechanical theory of the priesthood and Protestant anti-sacerdotalism, namely, the priesthood inherent in the Church acting through its properly appointed ministerial organs.

There are other lessons of a similar character which might be learned. There is a further lesson. We have commented more than once on the extreme rigidity of the Eastern Church, on its assumption of absolute correctness, and its refusal to meet any one except on its own terms. We are acquainted with the same phenomenon in the Roman Church. In both the position is absolutely untenable. The very tenacity with which the differences between the two Churches are held by each will prove to most minds the error of both. The spectacle is both sad and ridiculous if we see it in others. We should therefore avoid it ourselves. An assumption of Anglican or Protestant infallibility is just as absurd and just as untenable. Even if we cannot make other Churches be ready to learn from one another, we can, at any rate, attempt to learn ourselves. Even if our beliefs, or actions, or practices are right and wise, we are certain to find on examination points in them which we have passed over, and which the perhaps erroneous opinions of

others are able to bring out. There is no body of real Christians of whom we may not learn if we approach our differences with them in the true spirit of candid examination and a humble desire for knowledge.

We may conclude this survey, necessarily somewhat imperfect, of the relations of the English Church with the East by a few more practical suggestions. The first is as to our general policy. The English Church has no formal statement of its policy: it has no general executive body. Yet there has been on this point a strong and consistent tradition, which has already influenced all the different parties in the Church, and has modified the actions even of those who might be considered most unsympathetic with it. Our desire is clearly and definitely to recognize the Eastern Church, to consider that in the countries where it is at home it is not our business to weaken its influence or to attach its members to our Church. This should become a definite rule of policy in either direction. It is quite independent of the moral defects of the Eastern Church. It is a very common habit for some English people to devote themselves to denouncing the moral and spiritual condition of the Church, especially that portion under Turkish rule. There are undoubtedly very grave defects. But what would our own Church have been if for centuries we had been subject to such conditions as the Eastern Church has endured? Should we have had the courage and tenacity to remain loyal to our creed? For generations in the East the one duty which the Church has been able to fulfil is to hand down to those that came after its creed and traditions, to preserve if it is only the name of Christianity. It is natural that this should have inbred in them a conservative attitude which may have

become too rigid. It is excuseable if the laws which have forbidden them to extend their religion have often made them unspiritual. It is not for us to condemn or attack. We have far too many defects of our own. It is for us to help, but to help, not by making individual converts to our Church and further weakening Christianity, but by strengthening what is the hereditary Church of the country. A clear, definite line of refusing to be any party to proselytism, direct or indirect, should be our first rule.

The second is the cultivation of knowledge in a friendly spirit. The more different bodies of Christians know of one another, the less are they likely to preserve an attitude of bitterness. It is a condition of narrow isolation, combined with a regular system of proselytism, which causes bitterness between religious bodies. Knowledge, particularly personal knowledge, always tends to remove it. In this case both Churches are able to learn from one another. We can learn from them, for often their older, more conservative attitude will enable us to get behind some of our present controversies. They can learn from us if we realize that it is our mission to shew how freely and reverently a Church may approach the different problems which modern thought and living arouse. It was our attitude of reverent criticism which attracted some of the most thoughtful members of the Roman Church; it is by being friendly to all other Christians who will accept friendship, and true to our own mission, that we shall do our part best for Christianity. Feeble imitation produces not union but contempt.

And then, thirdly, we can give actual assistance whenever that assistance may be possible. A body of Christians suffering from misgovernment, oppression and spiritual isolation may naturally require help which

is given them in a friendly spirit. In certain cases, particularly where we are politically responsible, we can do that. And let us remember that it is worth doing for our own sakes as well as others'. A Church which considers only the well-being of its own members, without caring for any missionary enterprise, at home or abroad, will ultimately suffer from spiritual death. A body of Christians which refuses to have any intercourse with other Christian bodies will become barren, and mistake its own prejudices, customs and errors for gospel truths. By helping others, by intercourse with others, by studying and learning the life and history of others, we learn to brush away the cobwebs which are inclined to hide and disguise everywhere the reality of Christian teaching.

There will be much that is discouraging probably in what has been written, discouraging especially to those who are ardent advocates of Christian union, and have an idea that union with the East might come with great rapidity. Let us remember one fact which underlies all differences. It is that the fundamental truths of Christianity are held by all Christian bodies alike. The Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the historical facts of Christ's life are for us as for them the starting-point of our faith. A change in the present attitude can be brought about only by Christians agreeing to look at, to believe in, and to live up to what is essential and is accepted by all as such. If they were to do so more sincerely a very great change would rapidly come over the attitude of all Christian bodies to one another.

VI

THE TEACHING OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH[1]

THE following Essay can naturally make no pretence to completeness. It has two purposes. The first is to give, in the language of authorized documents, or of writers who may be regarded as representative interpreters of their Church, the teaching of the Russian Church particularly about those subjects on which questions might be asked, namely those on which its teaching differs from that of our own Church, or of the Church of Rome, or those on which controversy and discussion have been raised.

The second purpose is to try to bring out what the writer believes to be the temper and spirit of the Russian Church. Two Churches may have exactly the same offices and professions of Faith, and yet their life and spirit may be quite different. The same beliefs may be held in very different ways.

The Russian Church is, as is well known, a branch—by far the largest and most important branch—of the Orthodox Eastern Church, the Holy Synod, which is its governing body, having the authority of a Patriarch, and the Church being an independent Patriarchate on

[1] This Essay was read originally to a Society of East London Clergy, and afterwards published for the Eastern Church Association by Rivingtons, in 1897.

the same footing as the older Patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem.

The Eastern Church professes to be the only true Church, both Catholic and Orthodox, and in its general position is strongly anti-Roman in the sense of protesting with great vigour against the uncatholic and unhistorical claims of the Pope.

Speaking broadly, it bases its claims to be the Catholic and Orthodox Church upon the acceptance of:

(1) Holy Scripture;
(2) The Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed;
(3) The Seven General Councils;
(4) The Seven Sacraments.

In the following pages an attempt will be made to illustrate its teaching on certain points selected, not for their actual, but for their controversial importance. They represent either those doctrines which have unfortunately been subjects of controversy between different Christian bodies, or those about which discussion exists at the present time.

The two principal documents used are *The Longer Catechism of the Russian Church*, and *The Treatise on the Duty of Parish Priests*. The former, although based on older documents, is, as it at present stands, the work of Archbishop Philaret, the well-known Metropolitan of Moscow, and was promulgated by the Holy Synod in 1839. It was translated into Greek, and sent to the Eastern Patriarchs. *The Treatise on the Duty of Parish Priests* was first printed at St. Petersburg, in A.D. 1776. It is used by the whole Russian Church, and all candidates for Holy Orders are required to have read it, and to shew their acquaintance with its contents. Both these documents

are quoted in a translation published by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore in 1845.[1]

With regard to the latter it may be remarked that it represents an admirable compendium of priestly duties. There is a general idea current in England that the clergy of all other Churches, and especially those of the Eastern Church, are, compared with our own clergy, miserably educated. Such judgements of others are always unjust and arrogant, and certainly many candidates for Orders in the Church of England would gain greatly by possessing an authorized manual such as this, from which to learn their duties.

Both these documents are, in a sense, authoritative publications, but they have no symbolical authority. The Eastern Church has no general doctrinal tests beyond the Creed itself.

"As regards the question of doctrinal authority generally, it is important to understand that the members of the Eastern Church are neither bound in conscience, on the one hand, to every word and letter of any modern documents, nor left free, on the other hand, to indulge in an unlimited license of criticism. Beyond the Creed itself, the Eastern Church has no general doctrinal tests; no Oath, like that of Pope Pius IV.; no Symbolical Books, strictly speaking, like those of the Protestants and the Reformed; no Thirty-nine Articles, like those subscribed in England. But still she is not the less on that account provided with a sufficient security that the true faith, in its fullest sense, shall be held and taught under the letter of the Creed, and that the doctrinal decisions of former ages shall be maintained. This security lies in a living spirit of orthodoxy, protected against gainsayers, in case of necessity,

[1] *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, B.A., formerly of Merton College, Oxford. (Aberdeen: A. Brown & Co., 1845.)

by the terror of excommunication. Whatever is felt or known to form part of the faith of the Church, even though it be as yet unwritten, must be received with implicit veneration, as coming from the infallible Spirit of God: much more all doctrine of faith which has been written by orthodox men, or even by whole Synods, so far as it is felt and known to have the sanction of the Church."[1]

Reference is occasionally made to other documents, and to illustrate the more authorized statements much use has been made of the works of the well-known Russian writer, A. S. Khomiakoff. *L'Église Latine et le Protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient* was published at Lausanne in 1872, while his correspondence with Mr. Palmer, and his Essay on the Church, have been translated for the Eastern Church Association.[2]

In order to prevent an erroneous idea which might arise from the special subjects here touched upon, that, in the teaching of the Russian Church, there is any false sense of proportion, and that what we rightly call the Evangelical doctrines are not taught, it may be noticed that the true proportion of the Christian faith is very apparent in both the official documents with which we are concerned. In the instructions to parish priests, for example, under the heading of "What the priest ought to teach, and whence," it is said:

"It is the Priest's duty to teach his flock the Faith and the Law; the word law being used for the good works of the law. These two things Christ Himself taught, and began His preaching thus: *Repent ye, and believe the Gospel* (Mark i. 15). And the Apostle Paul

[1] Blackmore, *op. cit.* p. viii.

[2] *Russia and the English Church during the last Fifty Years*, vol. i., by W. J. Birkbeck. (Published for the Eastern Church Association. London: Rivington, Percival & Co., 1895.) Of M. Khomiakoff himself a full account is given by Mr. Birkbeck in the Preface.

in like manner taught both Jews and Greeks *repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ* (Acts xx. 21). To repentance belong the works of the law, to the Gospel, faith in Christ."

Of the faith it is said:

"The Faith consists in divers Articles, which Christians must believe and confess: of which some are principal, and so necessary to salvation, that without the knowledge of them a man cannot be saved, any more than he can live without the principal members of the body, as the head, the heart, and the like; while others, especially for simple people busied with their worldly callings, are less necessary, as being implied in the first, and belonging only to their more exact statement and explanation.

"To the first class of Articles belongs the mystery of the Holy Trinity; the mission of the Son of God into the world; our Justification by His Death; God's mercy to fallen man, and His Grace leading to repentance; and the like."

"All the Articles of the Faith are contained in the Word of God, that is, in the Books of the Old and New Testaments."

"The Law of the Ten Commandments is likewise contained in Holy Scripture, in the twentieth chapter of Exodus; and since it is innate in us, and the mirror of that Image of God in which man was created, it follows that every Christian, without exception, is most certainly required to know it, and to lead his life by it, doing good works, and eschewing evil."[1]

We may pass on now to the teaching concerning the Sacraments. The Russian Church recognizes and considers essential to a true Church seven Sacraments or Mysteries—viz. "Baptism, Unction with Chrism, Com-

[1] *A Treatise on the Duty of Parish Priests*, translated by Rev. R. W. Blackmore, in *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, pp. 159–161.

munion, Penitence, Orders, Matrimony, Unction with Oil."

A mystery or sacrament is defined as "a holy act, through which *grace*, or, in other words, the saving power of God, works *mysteriously* upon man."

"In Baptism man is mysteriously born to a spiritual life. In Unction with Chrism he receives a grace of spiritual growth and strength. In the Communion he is spiritually fed. In Penitence he is healed of spiritual diseases, that is, of sin. In Orders he receives grace spiritually to regenerate, feed, and nurture others, by doctrine and Sacraments. In Matrimony he receives a grace sanctifying the married life, and the natural procreation and nurture of children. In Unction with Oil he has medicine even for bodily diseases, in that he is healed of spiritual."[1]

Of the Sacraments generally, it is said:

"It is the Priest's duty before he administers any Sacrament to teach him who desires to receive it, if he be ignorant, what is the virtue of the same Sacrament. . . . For if he, to whom the Sacrament is administered, be left uninstructed of this, he will not know himself what he receives: consequently, neither can he have faith, which naturally follows only upon the knowledge of what is to be believed; and so he will not receive that grace of God, which is given in the Sacrament: *for our faith alone is the hand by which we receive all those gifts of God, which have been obtained for us by our Lord Jesus Christ.*"[2]

We may now pass on to the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. It will be most convenient to begin by some extracts from the Longer Catechism of the Russian Church.

[1] *The Longer Catechism*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* p. 84.
[2] *Duty of Parish Priests*, Blackmore, *ibid.* p. 204.

"*Q.* What is the Communion?

"*A.* The Communion is a Sacrament in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life.

"*Q.* What is the most essential act in this part of the Liturgy (*i.e.* in the Liturgy of the faithful)?

"*A.* The utterance of the words which Jesus Christ spake in instituting the Sacrament: Take, eat, this is My Body; Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood of the New Testament (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28). And after this, the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing the gifts, that is, the bread and wine, which have been offered.

"*Q.* Why is this so essential?

"*A.* Because at the moment of this act the bread and wine are changed, or transubstantiated, into the very Body of Christ, and into the very Blood of Christ.

"*Q.* How are we to understand the word *Transubstantiation*?

"*A.* In the exposition of the faith by the Eastern Patriarchs, it is said that the word transubstantiation is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord; for this none can understand but God; but only thus much is signified, that the bread truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true Body of the Lord, and the wine the very true Blood of the Lord."

And then comes a quotation from S. John of Damascus:

"It is truly that Body united with Godhead, which had its origin from the Holy Virgin: not as though that Body which ascended came down from heaven, but

because the bread and wine themselves are changed into the Body and Blood of God. But if thou seekest after the manner how this is, let it suffice thee to be told, that it is by the Holy Ghost; in like manner as, by the same Holy Ghost, the Lord formed flesh to Himself, and in Himself, from the Mother of God; nor know I aught more than this, that the word of God is true, powerful, and almighty, but its manner of operation unsearchable."—IV. xiii. 7.

"*Q.* What benefit does he receive who communicates in the Body and Blood of Christ?

"*A.* He is in the closest manner united to Jesus Christ Himself, and in Him is made partaker of everlasting life."[1]

The first point that we notice is, that the word Transubstantiation is used; and this is quite clearly and definitely part of the authorized teaching of the Eastern Church. But when once that is admitted, it becomes apparent that it is not used in the Roman sense.[2] That this is so, is shewn by a study of the Acts

[1] *The Longer Catechism*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* pp. 89, 91–92.

[2] Since the above was written, the following quotation from a Russian periodical, which appeared in the *Guardian* of May 12, 1897, puts the Russian objection to Roman doctrine very much more strongly than is done in the text. It may be noted that the whole question has been in recent years the subject of a discussion in Russian magazines.

"THE VIEWS OF THE METROPOLITAN PHILARET OF MOSCOW UPON THE LATIN DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

"Under the above heading the official journal of the St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy, the *Tzerkovny Vilstnik* (*Church Messenger*) of March 27 (April 8) contains an account of a conversation held between the former Bishop of New York, Dr. Young, and the famous Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, which, in view of a recent discussion which took place in our columns, will be read with interest by many of our readers. The interview between Dr. Young and the Metropolitan Philaret took place during the visit of the former to Russia in the early sixties, a few years before the death of Philaret in 1867:

'Upon Dr. Young putting some questions with regard to the use of the word Transubstantiation in the Russian Church, the Metropolitan

of the Synod of Bethlehem, or—as it is sometimes called —of Jerusalem. This Synod was held in the year 1672, at a time when the Eastern Church was largely under Roman influence, and represents that one of the authorized formulae of the Church which approaches

Philaret answered in substance as follows: "This word was introduced into Russia through Kieff in the seventeenth century, by means of the Roman Catholic theological literature which was then imported thither." [N.B.—At that time Kieff was still in the hands of the Poles, and every possible means were being taken to Latinize the Orthodox population of that part of Russia.] "Since that time some of our theologians have adopted it, but others very strongly disapprove of it. I myself belong decidedly to the latter class. The manner of our Lord's presence in the Blessed Eucharist is a mystery to be apprehended by faith, and not a matter to be speculated and dogmatised upon, or to be reasoned about. All definitions or pretended explanations, such as the use of the word Transubstantiation (*Transsubstantziatzija*), are nothing but attempts to penetrate into the mystery, and thereby they overthrow the essence of a sacrament."

'"But," said Dr. Young, "is not the word Transubstantiation used in your Longer Catechism?"

'"No," replied Philaret with emphasis, "it is not. In Russian we say [not *transssubstantziatzija*, but] *presushchestvlénie*, a word corresponding exactly to the Greek word *μετουσίωσις*."

'"But," said Dr. Young, "it is used more than once by Blackmore in his translation of the Russian Catechism."

'"In that case," replied the Metropolitan, "the translation is incorrect. We have taken good care that the word should not appear in our Catechism."

'This conversation, described by Dr. Young, is extremely interesting, as showing the extraordinary acuteness of our famous Metropolitan's theological intellect, in thus finding a means of preserving the Orthodox teaching concerning *μετουσίωσις* (*presushchestvlénie*) from the irruption into it of the coarse metaphysics of the schoolmen, with their self-made and, even from a philological point of view, unnatural term, *Transsubstantiatio*.'

"We may add that the word *presushchestvlénie* is the exact Slavonic equivalent of the Greek *μετουσίωσις*, the Slavonic word *súshchestvo* philologically corresponding not to *substantia*, but to *οὐσία* (*essentia*), and being formed in just the same way from *súshchi*, present participle of the verb *bytj*, to be. When it is remembered that the Metropolitan Philaret was himself the author both of the Longer Catechism and of the translation of the Articles of the Synod of Jerusalem in the form in which the Holy Synod of Russia finally accepted them, it will be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this conversation, and of the fact that it has been reprinted just at this time in one of the leading ecclesiastical journals of Russia."

nearest to Roman teaching.[1] In 1838, but not till then, these Acts were translated into Russian.

But in a considerable number of ways their language was changed, and all the more distinctly Roman expressions were taken out. In particular, all reference to the "accidents" is omitted; for example, where the Russian says:

"We believe that though the Body and Blood of our Lord are divided and separated, yet this takes place in the mystery of the Communion only with respect to the species of bread and wine by which alone they may be seen or touched."

The Greek has it:

"The Body and Blood of our Lord are divided and separated by hands and teeth in their accidents alone, and in their accidents of bread and wine."

The object clearly is to avoid accepting the scholastic philosophy, which is implied in such phraseology; and all that is implied in this is shewn by the following extract from Khomiakoff's essay on the Church:

"She does not reject the word 'Transubstantiation'; *but she does not assign to it that material meaning which is assigned to it by the teachers of the Churches which have fallen away.* The change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ is accomplished in the Church and for the Church. If a man receive the consecrated Gifts, or worship them, or think on them with faith, he verily receives, adores and thinks on the Body and Blood of Christ. If he receive unworthily he verily rejects the Body and Blood of Christ; in any case, in faith or in unbelief he is sanctified or condemned by the Body and Blood of Christ. But

[1] *See* J. M. Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church: General Introduction*, pp. 1173 ff.

this Sacrament is in the Church, and for the Church; not for the outside world, not for fire, not for irrational creatures, not for corruption, and not for the man who has not heard the law of Christ. In the Church itself (we are speaking of the visible Church), to the elect and to the reprobate the Holy Eucharist is not a mere commemoration concerning the mystery of redemption, it is not a presence of spiritual gifts within the bread and wine, it is not merely a spiritual reception of the Body and Blood of Christ, but is His true Body and Blood. Not in spirit alone was Christ pleased to unite Himself with the faithful, but also in Body and in Blood; in order that that union might be complete, and not only spiritual but also corporal."[1]

This extract will help to illustrate what underlies the discussion about a word. If transubstantiation or μετουσίωσις or any similar word be used to guard the doctrine of a real Sacramental Presence in the Eucharist, it would express adequately the teaching of the Russian Church; but if the use of the word is supposed to mean the acceptance of the technical Roman doctrine represented by it, then the word is misleading. The reality of the sacramental teaching of the Russian Church is undoubted, but equally strong is its rejection of the scholastic phraseology of the Roman Church.

The language used in authorized books on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is in accordance with patristic language. For instance, in the *Duty of Parish Priests*, it is said:

"More especially is earnest prayer required of the Priest in the service of the Divine Liturgy; for herein not only is that Mystery performed which Christ instituted at His last and mystical Supper, but also the whole economy of our salvation, wrought out by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is commemorated,

[1] *Russia and the English Church*, i. p. 207.

according to the commandment, This do in remembrance of Me." [1]

So in reference to Prayers for the Dead (of which I shall say more later) allusion is especially made to "such as are offered in union with the oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ," [2] and then a passage from S. Cyril of Jerusalem is quoted: "Very great will be the benefit to those souls for which prayer is offered at the moment when the holy and tremendous Sacrifice is lying in view."

The general meaning of the sacrificial language must be gathered from the Liturgy itself, which is, as is well known, the Greek Liturgy. In the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom there is:

(1) The prayer of the faithful immediately after the dismissal of the Catechumens, in which the Priest prays: "Make us to become worthy to offer to Thee prayers and supplications and unbloody sacrifices on behalf of all Thy people."

(2) In the prayer before the offertory, the Priest prays for himself that he may be held fit that "by me Thy sinful and unworthy servant, these gifts may be offered. For Thou art He that offereth and art offered, that receiveth and art given, O Christ."

(3) Immediately after the recital of the words of institution, at the invocation, the Priest prays: "Remembering therefore this saving command, and all things done for us, the cross, the tomb, the resurrection on the third day, the ascension into heaven, the sitting on the right hand, the second and glorious coming, we offer to Thee Thine own (*τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν*), in all things and for all things, we praise Thee, we bless Thee, we give thanks to Thee, we beseech Thee, our God, and we offer to Thee this reasonable and unbloody service (*λατρείαν*), and we beseech Thee, and entreat

[1] *The Duty of Parish Priests*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* p. 283.

[2] *The Longer Catechism*, Blackmore, *ibid.* p. 99.

and supplicate Thee, send down Thy Holy Ghost upon us and upon these gifts lying before Thee, and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that in this cup, the precious Blood of Thy Christ."

(4) The intercession begins, "And also we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of those who have gone to rest in faith."

I will conclude these extracts, which are, I think, necessary for our purpose, by one from a work of Khomiakoff's which has unfortunately not yet been translated. He is describing the difference between the worship of his own Church, and that of the Protestants and the Romans. Of the one he speaks of the coldness; of the other he says, "A wretched theory of terrestrial diplomacy, extended to the invisible world, has come to replace the faith in the organic unity of the Church."

Of his own Church he says:

"The man thus (by faith and love) united to Christ is no longer what he was, an isolated individual, he is become a member of the Church which is the body of Christ, and his life is become an integral part of that higher life to which he has so freely submitted himself. The Saviour lives in the Church, He lives in us. He intercedes, and it is we who pray: He recommends us to the Divine Favour, and it is we who mutually recommend ourselves to the Creator: He offers Himself in eternal sacrifice, and it is we who present to the Father this sacrifice of glorification, of gratitude and of propitiation, for ourselves and for all our brothers, whether they are still engaged in the dangers of terrestrial conflict or whether death has made them already pass into a condition of serene upward movement."

I might multiply extracts, but I think that those which I have given, taken partly from authorized formulae and partly from popular religious writings, are sufficient to let us see something of the belief and

temper of the Russian Church in contrast both to that of Rome and to many theologians among ourselves. This difference may be, I think, summed up somewhat as follows:

1. The Russian and the Eastern Church generally avoids, as much as possible, definition. The Roman Church is always trying to define the manner of the change in the Sacraments: the Eastern Church says it is a mystery. The tendency of the rest of the Western Christian world has been to try to define what it does not believe. The Eastern Church possesses much more the tone of the early Fathers: an intense reality and boldness of belief; the building up of the service in the words and language of Scripture; an absence of rigidity and exactness of language, where human language is felt to be inadequate and unnecessary.

2. The Russian Church avoids the obtrusively "priestly" language of the modern Roman Church. "Did they," says Cardinal Vaughan, "claim the power to produce the actual living Christ Jesus by transubstantiation upon the altar, according to the claims of the priesthood of the Eastern and Western Churches?" I do not know whether this exceedingly crude language would be accepted by modern Roman Catholic theologians: it certainly has a very different ring from that of the Russian Church. In their instructions to Parish Priests they say: "Before giving the communion of the most holy Body and Blood of Christ, the Priest should duly instruct them that wish to communicate, that This, the Body and Blood of Christ, is not only in name what it is called, but also verily and indeed is His Body and His Blood, under the forms of bread and wine: *for that which consummates this Sacrament is the operation of the Holy Ghost, to Whom nothing is impossible.*" The Roman language speaks of the power

of the Priest, the Russian of the prayers of the Priest and the work of the Holy Ghost.

3. The Roman Church dissociates the Priest from the Church, the Eastern associates him with it. How much this is so any one can see who studies the structure of the Eastern services. So the Sacraments are in and for the Church. "The Seven Sacraments are in reality not accomplished by any single individual who is worthy of the mercy of God, but by the whole Church in the person of one individual, even though he be unworthy."[1] This is the teaching which probably most of us have learned through the best English work on the Church and the ministry, and perhaps we are surprised to find it put before us so definitely in the far East. How wonderfully this theory influences all the teaching of the Church may be seen by the book on the duty of the Parish Priests, where the true proportion of the Christian ministry is preserved, as it is in the Encyclical of the English Archbishops on Anglican Orders.

In reference to Baptism, it is worth while to quote the Baptismal formula, as illustrating one of the points mentioned above. It is as follows:

"N. The servant of God is baptized in the Name of the Father.—Amen. And of the Son.—Amen. And of the Holy Ghost.—Amen. Now and ever, world without end.—Amen."

This brings out very clearly what was said above about the manner in which the Orthodox Church avoids "priestly" language. There are several of our formulae, derived from Latin sources, to which it would object that they exalt too much the authority of the Priest. This might be further illustrated by the Ordination offices.

[1] Khomiakoff, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 206.

As it has sometimes been thought that the Russian Church does not recognize Western Baptism, it is worth while to quote an authoritative statement on the subject:

"There are some ignorant men among the clergy who would re-baptize Romans, as well as Lutherans and Calvinists, when they come over to the Eastern Church; while the schismatics among ourselves are not ashamed even to re-baptize those of their people who fall away from the Church, in order to go over to their errors. But the seventh canon of the second Oecumenical Council sufficiently refutes both the ignorance of the first and the blindness of the last: for that holy Council, in the canon cited, forbids to re-baptize not only such as the Romans, Lutherans, and Calvinists (who all clearly confess the Holy Trinity, and admit the work of our salvation accomplished by the Incarnation of the Son of God), but even the Arians themselves."[1]

On the future state and prayers for the dead, the Catechism teaches:

"*Q.* In what state are the souls of the dead till the general resurrection?

"*A.* The souls of the righteous are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness; but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this.

"*Q.* Why may we not ascribe to the souls of the righteous perfect happiness immediately after death?

"*A.* Because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received by the

[1] *Duty of Parish Priests*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* p. 209. See also Birkbeck on *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. p. 63, where a full history of the Eastern custom with regard to re-baptism is given. The custom of re-baptizing Westerns has been in practice surrendered by both the Church in Greece and the Patriarchate of Constantinople for now (1909) nearly forty years.

Whether the other Patriarchates have followed the example set by these two in their Churches, I do not know.

perfect man, after the resurrection of the body and God's last judgment.

"*Q.* Why do we ascribe to the souls of the righteous a foretaste of bliss before the last judgment?

"*A.* On the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, who says in the parable that the righteous Lazarus was immediately after death carried into Abraham's bosom.

"*Q.* What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance?

"*A.* This; that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory."[1]

The Russian Church does not believe in Purgatory. As Archbishop Philaret (who drew up the Catechism in its present form) wrote[2]:

"The condition of a man's soul after death is fixed by his internal state; and there is no such thing as Purgatory, in which souls have to pass through fiery torments, in order to prepare them for blessedness. . . . There is no need of any other kind of purification when 'the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.'"

And Khomiakoff writes:

"We pray for the living that the grace of God may be upon them, and for the dead that they may become worthy of the vision of God's face. We know nothing of an intermediate state of souls, which have neither

[1] *Longer Catechism*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* pp. 98, 99.

[2] See *Comparative Statement of Russo-Greek and Roman Catholic Doctrines*, in Papers of the Russo-Greek Committee, No. IV.

been received into the kingdom of God, nor condemned to torture, for of such a state we have received no teaching either from the Apostles or from Christ; we do not acknowledge Purgatory, that is, the purification of souls by sufferings from which they may be redeemed by their own works or those of others: for the Church knows nothing of salvation by outward means, nor any sufferings whatever they may be, except those of Christ; nor of bargaining with God, as in the case of a man buying himself off by good works. . . . We pray in the spirit of love, knowing that no one will be saved otherwise than by the prayer of all the Church, in which Christ lives, knowing and trusting that so long as the end of time has not come, all the members of the Church, both living and departed, are being perfected incessantly by mutual prayer."[1]

It seems to me to be of particular importance to dwell upon this teaching at the present time. It is recognized that prayers for the departed have never been condemned by the English Church, and it is felt that the coldness and hardness of what may be called our traditional customs in that matter want correction. There is a natural tendency, especially for the more ignorant, to turn to the one system which lies clearly opened before us, and some are inclined to take over wholesale the modern Roman doctrine and practice concerning Purgatory. I venture to think that this is very much to be lamented. That system has had most deplorable practical developements: it is certainly alien to the whole spirit of early Christianity for centuries: it is a late and corrupt growth. On the other hand, we know that the custom of praying for the departed dates from the very beginning of Christianity, that it finds a regular place in all Liturgies, and answers to the needs of the human heart. The teaching that we have quoted

[1] *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. p. 217.

gives a perfectly consistent basis for this, and deserves our most careful attention.

I do not want to dwell too much on controversial points, but it is perhaps necessary to remind readers that we are often told that the Russian Church does teach Purgatory, and the Synod of Bethlehem is quoted. This is another of the passages where the text of the articles of that Synod was altered before being circulated in Russia.

On the Invocation of Saints, the Russian Church teaches as follows:

> "*Q.* What means of communion has the Church on earth with the Church in heaven?
>
> "*A.* The prayer of faith and love. The faithful who belong to the Church militant upon earth, in offering their prayers to God, call at the same time to their aid the Saints who belong to the Church in heaven; and these, standing on the highest steps of approach to God, by their prayers and intercessions, purify, strengthen, and offer before God the prayers of the faithful living upon earth, and by the will of God work graciously and beneficently upon them, either by invisible virtue, or by distinct apparitions, and in divers other ways."[1]

This is the official teaching, and it is very carefully guarded. The fact that all the Saints are prayed for in the Liturgy, including the Blessed Virgin, is significant. And Archbishop Philaret tells us that "No one has the power to deliver sinners from torments by the application of the works of *supererogation*, of Jesus Christ and of the Saints: because the merits of Jesus Christ are not under the control of man; and works of

[1] *Longer Catechism*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* p. 78.

supererogation in the Saints are impossible, as they themselves are only saved by grace."[1]

What is implied is, that the whole company of the faithful in heaven and earth are one. United to one another in the Communion of Saints, the prayers of the whole Church ascend to heaven on behalf of all; as we are benefited by the prayers of the living, so are we benefited by the prayers of those who have gone before. As we are benefited by the love of the living, so are we benefited by the love of the departed. And the whole Church is ever striving to rise upward. Beings who are not perfect must continually be striving after greater and greater sanctification, and the departed are in a state of "serene upward progress."[2]

On some other points I will now give, as shortly as I can, the teaching of the Russian Church.

On Icons, it is said: "We ought to honour them, but not to make Gods of them: for Icons are merely representations, which serve to remind us of the works

[1] Archbishop Philaret, *Comparative Statement, etc.*, p. 16.

[2] In the excellent little work by the Rev. George Body, on *The Present State of the Faithful Departed*, he writes (p. 50): "This belief of the intercession of the Saints does not involve the practice of direct invocation. Throughout I am using the term *Saints* to designate the whole company of those who are with Jesus in Paradise. *To invoke these with direct invocation has never been the wont of any portion of Catholic Christendom: no one has ever prayed to his mother or to his friends.*" This statement is incorrect. The practice mentioned is the habitual custom of the Russian Church. This is illustrated by the poem of Khomiakoff quoted in the previous essay, p. 178.

Often, when a child who has lost his mother is praying, he may be heard adding her name to those of the other saints whom he asks to pray for him. Mutual prayer of the dead for the living, of the living for the dead, and of both for the whole Church, is to the Russian the bond which links together the Church in one Communion of Saints. We are not now discussing the evidence and authority for this custom of invocation, nor how far it is beneficial. What is necessary is to realize that this is very different from the more developed forms of Adoration of the Saints.

of God and His Saints, to the intent that we, by looking upon them, may be stirred up to the imitation of holiness."

On Chrism, the language is very frank and definite. To the question, "Is the outward form of unction with Chrism mentioned in Holy Scripture?" it is answered: "It may well be supposed that the words of St. John (1 John ii. 20, 27) refer to a visible as well as to an inward unction; but it is more certain that the Apostles, for imparting to the baptized the gifts of the Holy Ghost, used *imposition of hands*, Acts viii. 15, 17. The successors of the Apostles, however, in place of this, introduced unction with Chrism, deducing, it may be, their precedent from the unction used in the Old Testament."[1]

The definition of Knowledge and Faith is very interesting:

"Knowledge has for its object things visible and comprehensible; Faith, things which are invisible and even incomprehensible. Knowledge is founded on experience, on examination of its object; but Faith, on belief of testimony to truth. Knowledge belongs partly to the intellect, although it may also act on the heart; Faith belongs principally to the heart, although it is imparted through the intellect."

On Faith and Works, the Catechism teaches as follows:

"*Q.* What should be the effect and fruit of true faith in the Christian?

"*A. Charity* or *love* and *good works* conformable thereto.

"*Q.* Is not faith alone enough for a Christian, *without love and good works?*

[1] *Longer Catechism*, in Blackmore, *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, p. 88.

"*A.* No; for faith without love and good works is inactive and dead, and so cannot lead to eternal life.

"*Q.* May not a man on the other hand be saved by love and good works, *without faith?*

"*A.* It is impossible that a man who has not faith in God should really love Him: besides, man, being ruined by sin, cannot do really good works, unless he receive through faith in Jesus Christ spiritual strength, or grace from God.

"*Q.* What is to be thought of such love as *is not accompanied by good works?*

"*A.* Such love is not real: for true love naturally shews itself by good works."[1]

On the Scriptures and Tradition, the teaching in the *Duty of Priests* is:

"Since the Articles of the Faith and the Law of the Ten Commandments are contained in Holy Scripture, as aforesaid, it follows, beyond dispute, that we hold the Word of God, that is, the books of the Old and New Testaments, as the source, foundation and perfect rule both of our holy Faith, and of the good works of the Law. *Wherefore it is our duty to search the Word of God, and draw from it divine truth, to teach the people; and to confirm our own words from the Word of God; and to this test to bring all doctrine, which either we ourselves may hear from others, or others from us, receiving what is agreeable thereto, and rejecting what is contrary.*"

"The writings of the holy Fathers are of great use: for they contain either the very same articles of the faith explained from the Word of God; or instructions serviceable for holy living; or else canons and rules for the discipline and good order of the Church, and of the whole Christian community, which we call traditions

[1] *Longer Catechism*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* pp. 117–118.

ecclesiastical. Wherefore we both may, and on occasion ought, in our discourses to quote from the writings of the holy Fathers also such passages as may be suitable for the explanation of any article of the faith, or for confirmation of our doctrine delivered to the people. But neither the writings of the holy Fathers, nor the traditions of the Church, are to be confounded or equalled with the Word of God, and His commandments; *for the Word of God is one thing; but the writings of the holy Fathers, and traditions ecclesiastical, are another.*"[1]

I will give one more extract, this time from the writings of Khomiakoff, which will, I think, suggest the teaching of his Church:

"The Spirit of God, who lives in the Church, ruling her and making her wise, manifests Himself within her in divers manners; in Scripture, in Tradition, and in Works; for the Church, which does the works of God, is the same Church which preserves tradition, and which has written the Scriptures. Neither individuals, nor a multitude of individuals within the Church, preserve tradition or write the Scriptures; but the Spirit of God, which lives in the whole body of the Church. Therefore it is neither right nor possible to look for the grounds of tradition in the Scripture, nor for the proof of Scripture in tradition, nor for the warrant of Scripture or tradition in works. To a man living outside the Church, neither her Scripture nor her tradition nor her works are comprehensible. But to the man who lives within the Church and is united to the spirit of the Church, their unity is manifest by the grace which lives within her."[2]

I have now, I think, given quite enough extracts to illustrate the teaching of the Russian Church on different doctrines, and must conclude this part of my subject with some more or less general observations.

[1] *Duty of Parish Priests*, Blackmore, *op. cit.* pp. 161, 164.
[2] *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. p. 198.

1. In the first place, what is quite clear about the Russian Church, as of the Eastern Church as a whole, is that it represents a natural and organic developement. A Russian monk once said to me, speaking of the Reformation, "You, you have changed things; we have never changed anything from the days of the Apostles." The statement is, of course, in its extreme form, untrue; but in another sense it is perfectly true: there has never, or only in smaller matters, been any deliberate change. The growth and modification has been natural, unconscious and organic. The Eastern Church has never been in the position of having to make a selection, so to speak, of what it will accept or reject; it has never reconstructed and recast its teaching. An historian, looking over long periods, can notice changes. He can, perhaps, date the first appearance of this or that custom: the modifications of the first three centuries may be a matter of dispute; but a great transforming influence like scholasticism, or the Reformation, or the Council of Trent, the Eastern Church has never known.

2. And this leads us to a second point. The Church of Russia has never been influenced, except in details, by the whole developement of Western Theology, from S. Augustine onwards. It preserves for us the tone and the spirit and the thought of the Church of S. Chrysostom and S. Athanasius. That this is altogether a gain, I should be the last to assert. The first great break in Christian unity was of infinite harm to the Church, as all breaks have been, for it cut off the East from the active religious thought of the West, and it took away any check that might have existed to what all will probably recognize as the one-sided developement of Western thought. The West has retained and intensified a heightened sense of the individual life, of the reality of sin, of the necessity of personal conver-

sion; it has lost, in the introduction into all theology, whether Roman or Protestant, of hard, legal ideas, of a too rigid system, of an exaggerated desire for construction, of a banishment of mystery, of the attempt to solve, by human reason, problems which are quite inexplicable. The early Councils anathematized those who added to the creeds. The Eastern Church sometimes dates the disunion of Christendom to the time when the Western Church added the *Filioque*. At any rate, an importation of philosophy into religious belief, and an attempt at precision in many questions where precision is impossible, has burdened us with creeds, and articles of religion which are treated almost as creeds, and which certainly subject all the different Churches to the anathema pronounced at the Council of Ephesus against those who added articles to the Christian faith.

3. We shall find that a Russian theologian will tell us that we in the West always look at everything through Roman spectacles. Either we have received our doctrines straight from Rome, or have developed them in opposition to a Roman point of view. There is, they would tell us—and tell us with truth—an older, and a different point of view, from which they look at things. They are not troubled with the conflict between Scripture and tradition, for both alike are part of the teaching of the Church: the Bible is a part of tradition, and tradition is in the Bible. They do not ask whether a man is justified by faith or by works, as the antithesis of the two is to them impossible. "When we ask, 'Can true faith save without works?' we ask a senseless question; or, better to say, no question at all. If the faith is a living faith which does works, it is faith in Christ, and Christ in faith."

Enough has been said about the teaching of the

Russian Church and about its doctrinal attitude. It has, of course, been necessary to touch only on some points, but I hope that what has been said will not only have elucidated those special points, but also will have given some idea of the mental attitude of the Russian Church as a whole. I must add now a few words on the external side of the Russian Church life. A very unjust and one-sided estimate is often taken of this.

The historical developement of the Russian people has been different from our own, they are of a different race and character, and in civilization they started many centuries later than we did. Their religion, again, is in many ways different, but no one can doubt its intense reality and power. One of the elements of power and stability in Russia is the hold which religion and the National Church have on the great mass of the people. The universal belief in miracles, the veneration of the Icons, and the passion for pilgrimages, are all signs of this devotion, and help in turn to educate and foster the religious feeling. There are few contrasts greater than that of passing from a Greek monastery on Mount Athos to the great Russian houses. There is no sight in Palestine more impressive than that of the devotion and enthusiasm and endurance of the Russian pilgrims.

There are three characteristics of the Russian Church that I should like to dwell on somewhat longer. The first is, that it is a National Church. One of the characteristics of the Eastern Church has been that it has apparently so far solved the problem of combining in Christian unity national churches, and of identifying the National Church with the life of the nation without leading to its separation from other bodies. Foremost among these Churches, certainly the largest National Church

in the world, is that of Russia, with perhaps 80,000,000 of adherents. It is a National Church, and it has been bound up in an especial way with the fortunes of the country. In the great struggle with the Tartars, it was round the Church that the defence rallied, and some of the monasteries were the great fortresses of resistance against a foreign invader. So, too, the unique position of the Tzar in the Church, however it be defined, and however it be justified, is a sign of the identification of the Church and the nation, and the nation with the Church.

Then, secondly, the Russian Church is the Church of the laity. The theoretical side of this has been referred to in what was said of the place of the laity in the Church. The Eastern Church, and especially the Russian, considers that to the whole body of the Church —laity as well as clergy—belongs the Divine Spirit, working through faith and love, which preserves the Church from error. Practically, this fact is brought out by the extent to which the religious life of the people never requires, as it so often does in this country, to be kept alive by the energy of the clergy. The drunken village pope has become a typical character in fiction—and unfortunately he is not unknown in real life—but if, in England, the parson is immoral or incompetent, the church is deserted ; in Russia, the pope is compelled by the people to perform the ministrations which he alone can do. Their religion comes from themselves, and they are taught it as part of the traditions which they inherit.

And then, thirdly, if we were to try to sum up the distinguishing features of the Russian Church—just as we might say that one great characteristic of the English Church was practical philanthropy, or of Germany a devotion to theological study, or of Scotland a taste

for metaphysical and theological discussion—so of Russia we might say that it was religious devotion. There may be superstition, although that is a word the meaning of which, except as a term of abuse, is very difficult to fix; there is probably in many cases an insufficient grasp of the connexion between morality and religion; but of the deep religious devotion of the people there can be no doubt. It is strong, simple, deep, and makes Russia a more formidable power, in certain circumstances, than we are inclined to believe, or than perhaps many of its own rulers realize. The half-religious, half-political movement which presses Russia ever southwards to the holy places, is one of the forces which will mould history in the future much more surely than the skill of its statesmen. Russia is a religious power not to be despised, one of the great factors which will mould the religion of the future. What, then, are its relations to England and the Anglican Church?

This is not a very easy question to answer, for it must be remembered that in Russia, as in England and as in Rome, there are two points of view. Just as with us there are Bishops who write—as one wrote to me—"that he considered the whole Eastern Church to be so corrupt and idolatrous, that the less contact we have with it the better," so, not long ago, a Russian Bishop in America wrote: "Who, then, belongs to this One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church? . . . Only the Eastern Churches (remain) in the fold—the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem; the Churches of Russia, Greece, Georgia, Roumania, some Slavic countries, and others now known under the name of Orthodox." "All the Western Christians, on the other hand—the Roman Catholic Church and all the Protestant communities, sprung out of the bosom

of this Church: Anglican, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Calvinist, etc.—all these do not belong to the One Holy Catholic Church." . . . "The Anglican Church, besides distorting the doctrine of the Sacraments and other dogmas, cannot even, so far, prove her hierarchy's claim to direct Apostolic succession, while other sects have no trace at all of hierarchy or of Sacraments." And then he goes on very clearly, "But it may be that some persons will ask: 'Is salvation possible in these Christian communities? Can it really be that it is not?' To this we answer directly and decisively that it is not."

I have given this quotation in order to make it clear that there are extreme men in the Russian Church as there are in the English, and I shall have to refer to it again in conclusion. I may state definitely that this is not the feeling of the Russian Church as a whole, and the teaching implied is incorrect. It is true, indeed, that the Eastern Church considers that it alone is the true Church, excluding the Roman Catholics quite as much as ourselves, but its writers are careful to guard against condemning those outside its own body.

"Inasmuch as the earthly and visible Church is not the fulness and completeness of the whole Church which the Lord has appointed to appear at the final judgment of all creation, she acts and knows only within her own limits; and (according to the words of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. v. 12), does not judge the rest of mankind, and only looks upon those as excluded, that is to say, not belonging to her, who exclude themselves. The rest of mankind, whether alien from the Church, or united to her by ties which God has not willed to reveal to her, she leaves to the judgment of the great day. The Church on earth judges for herself only, according to the grace of the Spirit, and the freedom granted her through Christ, inviting also the rest of

mankind to the unity and adoption of God in Christ; but upon those who do not hear her appeal she pronounces no sentence, knowing the command of her Saviour and Head, 'not to judge another man's servant.'"[1]

Again, we should, I think, remember that although not so hard or rigid as the Roman Church, and resenting its attitude very much, the Eastern Church in its very nature is certainly more immobile. That arises really, I believe, from the fact that it has, as I have said, hardly ever made any conscious change; that it represents, in a way which no Western Church can, an organic growth. Hence diplomatic arrangement of doctrines will do no good in dealing with Russia, whatever might be the case with Rome.

"The Church has in itself nothing of a State, and can admit of nothing like a conditional union. It is quite a different case with the Church of Rome. She is a State, . . . and has a right to act as a State. Union is possible with Rome. Unity alone is possible with Orthodoxy."[2]

I have stated these facts definitely, because it seems to me necessary. As soon as the decision of the Pope on Anglican Orders had been published, some people began immediately to suggest that, as the Church of Rome had rejected us, steps should at once be taken for our reunion with the East, while others were in just as great a hurry to be reunited with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. There is something intensely unpractical and undignified in this hurry. It is rather like a woman who, having failed to secure the attentions of one suitor, should advertise to the world her desire to get another.

[1] Khomiakoff, in *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. p. 194.
[2] *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. pp. 7-8.

We shall never heal the divisions in the body of Christ by methods such as these; we shall never thus bring to an end differences which are the result not only of doctrinal dispute, but of deep-seated diversity of character and history, and have been intensified by centuries of estrangement. Hasty attempts at reunion would be only too likely to bring to the front the extremer sections on either side, just as we have had the doctrines of the Roman Church re-stated for us by a Cardinal whose language is not only unattractive to English Churchmen, but also would be looked upon as extreme by a large number of members of his own community, and those the most learned; while we must ask, as sensible men, Is our own Church sufficiently educated to make a proposal for reunion in any way practical?

If we are to aim at reunion, our method must be different; it must be one which works without caring for the immediate results, one which works by the sober path of theological study, of mutual intercourse and charity, of educating both ourselves and others.

The immediate practical conclusion that I wish to be drawn is the realization of the existence of the Russian Church as a great fact in religion, and as a great witness in Christian theology. Rome bulks very large in the eyes of some of us. It is at hand, and we are conscious of it. It is a good thing that we should realize that there is another Church which, on historical grounds, has as great, or even greater claims to represent the Catholic teaching of the undivided Church,—that, in many points, it bears a living witness against the teaching of the Roman Church, and that in all these points it is on the side of our own Church. We cannot, with the Eastern Church before our eyes, believe that

the claim the Church of Rome makes to be the one Church, is true. Every historian knows that these claims are untenable in history; the existence of the Eastern Church is an object-lesson of the truth of history. We, as English churchmen, appeal to an undivided Church; when the Church is—if it be God's will—once more united, then we shall receive and accept the testimony of that united body.

And a very definite work is before us. We have to do what our position helps us very much to do, to build up a sober exposition of Catholic truth, both historical and scientific. We have much sympathy in doing so from many outside our body. Even fifty years ago, Khomiakoff wrote: "England, with its modest science and its serious love of religious truth, might seem to give some hope." It is our reverent criticism which has attracted the best minds of the Roman Church.

We must remember that to be Catholic does not mean to revive this or that mediaeval custom, or adopt this or that formula. It means to realize the Catholic faith in all its breadth and freedom—to understand that it is a body of truth which illustrates and is illustrated by every side of truth and knowledge. We must learn to be more historical, and more scientific, and because we are both, more Catholic. And then, when we look on the practical side, we have to realize that our own Church, to deserve its name Catholic, should be truly and in reality, what it is to only a certain extent at present, the Church of the Nation, and the Church of the Empire.

To perform these two tasks, we must learn to combine loyalty to our own Church with charity towards other Christian bodies. Charity without loyalty is a mere name. We must believe in our own Church, but

not allow that belief to make us rigid or narrow. Sober research, earnest work, loyalty, charity, prayer—these are the methods by which we can advance the Reunion of Christendom.

APPENDIX

A. Service Books of the Russian Church.—The services of the Russian Church are for the most part identical with those of other branches of the Greek Church, and the service books are largely the same, but translated into the Old Slavonic or Church Language. The services may be divided into—

(1) The Liturgy.
(2) The Daily Offices.
(3) The Occasional Offices, Rites, and Ceremonies.

The following are the principal books required :

1. *Tipikon* (Gr. Τυπικόν), the book of the rules and regulations to determine the service for the seasons and days of the year. The services and directions are both often very complicated.

2. *Sloujebnik* (Gr. Λειτουργικόν). This contains the text of the three Liturgies of S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and the Presanctified. This must be supplemented, however, by the books containing the Deacons' portion and the Fixed Hymns, while the variable portions are given in the books mentioned below.

3. *Trebnik* (Book of Needs) or Euchologion. This contains most of the occasional sacraments and rites, and also generally the fixed portions of the Liturgy.

4. *Tshasoslow*, in Greek Ὡρολόγιον, contains the Canonical Hours.

5. The *Lections* are usually contained in three separate volumes with the Εὐαγγελιστήριον or table of lessons.

6. The variable portions of the service are contained in the *Octoich* (Ὀκτώηχος), containing the variable hymns for

Sundays, the *Triod* (Τριώδιον), those for Lent and the three preceding weeks, the *Pentakostariy* (πεντηκοστάριον) those for Easter, and the *Mineya* (Μηναία), the immovable feasts.

Brightman, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, lxxxii. ; King, *Rites, etc.*, p. 42 ; Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church : General Introduction*, p. 819.

B. The three *Liturgies* in use are—

(1) The Byzantine Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, the Liturgy in ordinary use.

(2) The Byzantine Liturgy of S. Basil, used upon all the Sundays of the Great Fast, except Palm Sunday ; upon Holy Thursday, the vigils of Christmas and Epiphany, and S. Basil's day.

(3) The Liturgy of S. Gregory Dialogos, or of the Presanctified, used on Wednesdays and Fridays in the Great Fast.

A complete and scholarly edition of the Greek texts of S. Chrysostom and S. Basil is given in Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. 353-411. The Greek use differs only in a few rubrics from the Slavonic. Full accounts of these Liturgies are given in Neale, with translations.

C. The Canonical Hours.—There are eight canonical hours, but prayers are actually said three times daily. Matins (Μεσονυκτικὸν), Lauds (Ὄρθρον), and Prime, being said early in the morning ; Tierce, Sext, and the Liturgy later ; Nones, Vespers (Ἑσπερινὸν or *wetshernya*), and Compline (ἀπόδειπνον) in the evening. Neale, *op. cit.* p. 894 ; King, *op. cit.* p. 123.

D. The *Occasional Offices* are very numerous, including all that is implied by both the *Rituale* and *Pontificale* in Latin, and also a large number of Domestic Offices.

E. Translations into English :

KING, *Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, London, 1772.

This is the only translation made from the Russian. It contains the Liturgies of S. Chrysostom and the Presanctified, the

Daily Offices, and most of the Occasional Offices, including the ordination services.

NEALE, *History of the Holy Eastern Church: General Introduction*, vols. i. and ii. London, 1850.

Contains descriptions and translations of the Liturgy, and much information, with translations, of the other Offices.

NEALE, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints, John Chrysostom*. London, 1860.

ROBERTSON, *αἱ θεῖαι λειτουργίαι: the Divine Liturgies*. London, 1894.

SHANN, *Euchology*. Contains a large number of the Daily Offices. London, 1894.

SHANN, *Book of Needs*. Contains many of the Occasional Offices. London, 1894.

F. Doctrinal Statements of the Eastern Church.—As has been explained above (p. 194) no document has symbolical authority except the Creed. The theology of the Russian Church is based on the Seven General Councils and on the Fathers, especially the *De Fide Orthodoxa* of S. John of Damascus. The chief modern authoritative documents are the following:

1. *The Answers of the Patriarch Jeremiah to the Lutherans.* These have not apparently ever been translated into Russian, or published in Russia with authority.

2. *The Orthodox Confession of the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East.*—This was written by Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kieff, 1632-47.

> "If it be asked how much weight is to be attached to the Orthodox Confession, we answer, that besides all that we have related above of the care taken originally in its composition and revision, and of its approval both by the Synod of Jassy, and by the four Eastern Patriarchs, it received afterwards the testimonies of Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, . . . of Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, with his Synod held at Bethlehem in 1672; also at the same time of Dionysius, Patriarch of Constantinople; again in 1691, that of a Synod held at Constantinople; and

lastly in 1696, that of Adrian, Patriarch of Moscow. It is acknowledged by the Spiritual Regulation subscribed by the Bishops and Clergy of Russia in the year 1720; and all Russian Theologians since have rested very much on this book." (Blackmore, *op. cit.* p. xxv.)

3. *The XVIII Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem.*—The Synod was held in 1672. The articles seem to have been communicated to the Russian Church in 1721, and published in an authorized Russian translation, which differs in many points from the Greek, in 1838. (See Neale, *op. cit.* p. 1173.) The Greek may be found in Hardouin's *Concil.*, xi. p. 180.

   Both the above documents are somewhat tinged with Latin teaching.

4. *The Longer Catechism.*—This in its present form was drawn up by Philaret, Archbishop of Moscow. It was adopted by the Holy Synod in 1839, and sent to all the Eastern Patriarchs, and to other churches of the same rite and communion. Translated by Blackmore (see below).

5. *The Treatise on the Duty of Parish Priests.*—Composed by George Konissky, Bishop of Mogileff, with the assistance of Parthenius Sopkofsky, Bishop of Smolensk. It was first printed at St. Petersburg, A.D. 1776. It has been adopted by the whole Russian Church; and all candidates for holy Orders in the Diocesan Seminaries and in the Superior Spiritual Academies are required to have read it. Translated by Blackmore.

6. To these we may add the declaration of Faith made by a bishop at his consecration. It is translated by King, p. 293.

G. Translations of Doctrinal Works:

BLACKMORE, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church.* Aberdeen, 1845.

Contents.—The Primer or Spelling Book; The Shorter and Longer Catechisms; The Duty of Parish Priests.

H. Some Works on the Russian Church.

KING, *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia.* London, 1772.

NEALE, *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: General Introduction.* London, 1850.

ROMANOFF, *Sketches of the Rites and Customs of the Graeco-Russian Church.* London, 1869. (Popular.)

KHOMIAKOFF, *L'Église Latine et le Protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient.* Lausanne and Vevey, 1872.

BIRKBECK, *Russia and the English Church during the last fifty years.* London, 1895. Published for the Eastern Church Association.

STANLEY, *Lectures on the Eastern Church.* London, 1862.

MACAIRE, *Introduction à la Théologie Orthodoxe*, 1857–59.

MOURAVIEFF, *History of the Church of Russia.* Translated by Blackmore, 1842.

WILBOIS, *L'Avenir de l'Église Russe.* Translated as *Russia and Reunion* by C. R. Davey Biggs, D.D. Published for the Eastern Church Association. London, 1908.

DAMPIER, *The Orthodox Church in Austria-Hungary*, I. Published for the Eastern Church Association. London, 1905.

ADENEY, *The Greek and Eastern Churches.* "International Theological Library." London, 1908.

VII

METHODS OF EARLY CHURCH HISTORY[1]

THE study of the history of the early Church is distinguished alike for its difficulty and uncertainty. The intimate bearing that it must have on current controversy and the paucity of material combine to produce the very widest divergence of opinion, and suggest to many thoughtful readers the doubt whether any conclusion is possible. Even in the last decade, critical opinions have undergone a great change, and current histories have been mostly written on the basis of a criticism which has become discredited. It is the purpose of the following pages to review so far as is possible the developement of historical criticism concerning the origin of Christianity. Such a review will suggest the limits within which there has been progress and advance, and the methods by which it has been attained. It will make it abundantly clear that if a sufficiently long period is taken the advance has been real and undoubted, and that progress has depended on the adoption of certain methods; while

[1] This Essay contains the material of two lectures delivered by me at Trinity College, Cambridge, as Birkbeck lecturer in ecclesiastical history, and published in *The English Historical Review*, No. liii., January 1899. The books to which I have been most indebted are Seebohm's *Oxford Reformers* and Mark Pattison's *Life of Casaubon*. The nature of the Essay makes detailed references unnecessary.

it will suggest the lines which must be followed in the future. A short survey, such as is attempted here, must necessarily be incomplete. Many names must be passed over, and the attention concentrated on those writers or schools that are typical of a certain set of opinions, or have made definite contributions to the problems before them, either by collecting material, or by originating new methods, or by seeing more clearly the real question which should be asked.

I

The critical study of Church history dates from the later Renaissance, but if we wish to gain some knowledge of its starting-point we must turn to an earlier period. Two writers will help us to understand the conceptions of the middle ages. The Norman Ordericus Vitalis, in the twelfth century, prefaced his chronicles of his own country with a description of the beginnings of Christianity. His materials are ample, for he is able to supplement from a long list of lives of the Apostles, from the pseudo-Clementine writings, and other similar sources the meagre accounts which are given us in the canonical Scriptures. He appears to us most uncritical, yet he writes history without any dogmatic purpose. We are reminded that the great wealth of apocryphal literature, the lives of the Apostles and of the saints, the apocalypses and visions which were accepted without a whisper of suspicion through the middle ages, however valueless from what we are accustomed to call a scientific point of view, played a great part in the imaginative life of that time. Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte* has become possible; but we have lost the belief which inspired the *Divina Commedia*.

Very different and more actively uncritical is the

Church history of Ptolemaeus of Lucca, who was a Dominican and papal librarian at the beginning of the fourteenth century. He opens his work with a life of the Founder of Christianity as the first Pope. No higher dignity could apparently be ascribed to Him than that of first of the pontiffs; and who could doubt the prerogatives of S. Peter and his successors when it is narrated how, "after the passion of the Lord, the blessed Peter, by special appointment, obtains the papal chair," when full proofs of his peculiar dignity are given on the authority of Decretals, when it is further told how he instituted the fasts of Lent and Advent, how he consecrated Linus and Cletus as his coadjutors that he might give himself up to a life of prayer, and left Clement as his successor; and how, besides three bishops, he ordained seven deacons and ten presbyters?

We need not illustrate further. These two works shew clearly enough the two types of false elements which have to be eliminated, the imaginative and the dogmatic, the apocryphal writings and the pseudo-Decretals. Both are to us uncritical, but they were not necessarily so in themselves. For every statement Ptolemaeus cites an authority with the precision of a lawyer accustomed to defend his case in court. The whole was systematically worked out on accepted data. A history which was miraculous and papal was the only one which would have gained a moment's credence. A complete transformation of men's minds was necessary to enable them to learn what was genuine and what was forged, to distinguish between the true and the false. A mass of unused material had to be published, critical principles evolved, the whole sifted and dated, and, above all, what we are accustomed to call the historical sense developed, that men might learn to realize the distinction between their own time and times that were past.

II

The incentive to new ideas came first, as it always has come, through the application to Church history of the methods which had been acquired in secular learning and the study of the classics. The earlier Renaissance was absorbed in pagan literature, and was itself half pagan; but when once the idea took hold of the learned that there had been a time when men thought differently, and that truth, at any rate historical truth, must be sought in the origin of a system, they were not slow to apply the same methods to religion. A frank paganism could not satisfy the needs of their heart. The barbarism of scholasticism could no longer feed the souls of those who had learnt the humanism of Plato. The monastic ideal had ceased to be an inspiring creed; men were learning that philosophy did not begin by meaning asceticism. It was a Roman cardinal who first suggested that the Decretals were not genuine, and it was a papal historian who was the first to make these ideas a part of his history. There were other motives besides learning which prompted Laurentius Valla to question the *Donation* of Constantine; but criticism had now been started. It was from the side of Plato and the Platonic academy that the problem first attracted the learned men of Florence; and Plotinus, Macrobius and the pseudo-Dionysius were the masters of Ficino when he lectured on the Christian religion. Savonarola had taught men what religion was; Laurentius Valla had lectured on the New Testament; and Colet had returned to Oxford in 1496 a lover of Dionysius and of S. Paul, eager to preach the Gospel and ardently desirous to promote reform.

Colet began to lecture at Oxford on the Epistle to the Romans, and gave the first example of an historical

method of exposition. Grocyn discovered that the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite could not be by a pupil of S. Paul, and was obliged to accept the suggestions of Valla which he had hoped to combat; but it was Erasmus who learnt in England not only Greek but the historical method which Colet and his companions were developing, and by his wit and learning transformed into a great movement what had been only a small stream of academic opinion. It was in 1516, the year before Luther published his theses, that Erasmus finished his Greek Testament and his edition of Jerome. That year saw the beginning of sober Church history. To achieve this was clearly and definitely the purpose of Erasmus, a purpose to which he adhered tenaciously all his life. The aim was the same which had inspired Colet twenty years before, when he lectured on the Romans, and during those twenty years a small body of men, who met first at Oxford, had matured and developed it. The publication of Jerome would teach men to study the Bible as he had studied it, and not as Augustine had done; the publication of the Greek text with historical notes would overthrow the conventional treatment of the Vulgate; the study of the Life of Christ would gradually produce that reform in life which would mean reform in the Church. Men had learnt, Erasmus reminds us, to seek the true Aristotle in his own writings; in the same way you will find the true Christ. No one would be called a Platonist who had not read Plato; no man deserves the title of Christian who has not studied the words of Christ. It is disgraceful for a philosopher not to know the mind of his master; it is still more disgraceful for us, bound by so many sacraments to Christ, not to know teaching which will bring the most certain felicity.

But the New Testament was not only to be read: it had also to be interpreted. There was a recognized method of doing so which had prevailed when Erasmus wrote, a method which was supposed to be bound up with orthodoxy. Erasmus had different methods. All branches of knowledge must be brought to bear—natural philosophy, geography, history, classics. "If you refer to commentaries, choose out the best, such as Origen (who is far above all others), Basil, Jerome, Ambrose, etc.; and even these read with discrimination and judgement, for they were men ignorant of some things, and mistaken in others."[1] It is from Origen that he gives an example of what he means by the historical method. "Thus, but more at length and more elegantly, are these things related by Origen, I hardly know whether more to the pleasure or profit of the reader; although, be it observed, they are construed *altogether according to the historical sense*; nor does he apply any other method to the Holy Scriptures than that which Donatus applies to the comedies of Terence when elucidating the meaning of the classics." And these sound and sober methods were gradually to influence mankind. "I have never attempted anything else than to arouse the study of good literature, to recall men from Jewish ceremonies to the Gospel, to substitute the Scriptures for scholastic subtleties." And learning will in the end prevail.

"If princes will not admit wise counsels, if Churches prefer the authority of the world to that of Christ, if theologians and monks will not relinquish the synagogue, there is one path left. Sow the good seed. A crop will come up. Educate youth. Encourage the study of antiquity. Religion without piety and learning without letters will vanish away."

When Jerome published his Vulgate, Augustine dwelt

[1] Seebohm, *op. cit.* p. 330.

on the danger which would result. "If any error should be admitted to have crept into the Holy Scriptures, what authority would be left to them?" Martin Dorpius repeated these words against the modern Jerome, and the revised version of the New Testament has received exactly the same criticism from those who imagine that truth will find its support chiefly in ignorance and error. Certainly the work of Erasmus was not followed by a period of lessened respect for the Bible.

The life of Erasmus has two sides. His biographers represent him as one engaged in correspondence with the leading men of Europe, and historians are accustomed to denounce his weakness in not taking a side. Even the most friendly hint that at any rate he was not the stuff of which martyrs are made. Such critics completely misunderstand him. We must remember that his public life was not the principal work on which he was engaged. His most arduous labours were expended on books which many of his biographers hardly mention. It is, indeed, true that his name was affixed to editions of the Fathers to which his contribution was slight; but an historian of learning must remember that during the years in which he was rebuking Luther for his violence, and the monks for their ignorance, he was laying the foundation of an historical study of Christianity, helping in editions of the Fathers, contributing prefaces and criticisms, distinguishing between the false and the genuine, hoping that the gradual spread of true religion and sound learning might extinguish, by the subtle process of intellectual influence, the barbarous errors of the Schoolmen and the violent half-truths of the Protestants.

History has followed a very different track from that marked out for it by Erasmus. He deplored how the changes which he was accused of fostering were even

more injurious to learning and true religion than had been the old order. He worked for a rational, a sober and orderly progress. He found even before he died that the truths which he saw (if darkly) had to be beaten out for most men by the hard blows of controversy and discussion. He had to endure the fate of almost every man of learning. His carefully balanced conclusions were only half understood. Statements which bore the same relation to his words that many a sermon bears to the Gospel were spread widely through Europe. It is not the first time, nor the last, that a scholar has felt that his ideas seem very different when translated into the language of the people. Crude statements are repeated without their limitations; concessions introduced for precision of language are magnified into definite assertions; the desire to see all sides is transformed into attacks on the fundamental position. This must be the fate of scholars. Bishop Lightfoot was obliged to write concerning his essay on *The Christian Ministry*: "I need hardly say here what I have said on other occasions, that I do not hold myself responsible for the interpretations which others (whether friends or opponents) have put upon my language, or for the inferences which they have drawn from my views."

III

Luther used Erasmus' Greek Testament almost as soon as it came out. He even then discovered that it conflicted with his dogmatic opinions, and he expressed a dislike of history unless it corroborated his teaching. Protestantism was based on a supposed appeal to history, but it was a history very imperfectly understood; it has always considered history a good servant, but a bad master, and has never formed its opinions on

historical lines. The ideals of Erasmus were inherited only by a small and diminishing body of scholars ; those of Luther and his opponents divided the world.

The latter half of the sixteenth century produced the two typical Protestant and Catholic histories. The Magdeburg Centuriators, with Matthias Flacius at their head, succeeded in transforming ecclesiastical history into a dry and dogmatic subject. In their criticism on their predecessors they shew how their conception of the subject had been modified by the events of the Reformation. Previous historians had neglected the developement of doctrine. The neglect had been natural. When it was believed that there had been no change since the days of our Lord, what need to write the history? But Protestantism was based—or fancied itself based—on an appeal to history, on the theory that the teaching of the Apostolic age was different from that of the middle ages : and a history of Church doctrine became a necessity. The same may be said of Church ceremonies and of Church organization. When men ceased to look upon S. Peter as a Pope they had learnt that there was a change. We recognize that a new conception was arising. We are astounded at the contrast between the meagre performances of their predecessors and the huge folios which the Centuriators produced, but it is impossible to ascribe to them much share of the true spirit of research. They are dogmatic historians, writing with a dogmatic purpose. Lutheranism had once to be discovered ; now it must be defended, and history must be written to do this. We need not ascribe to them dishonesty any more than to their opponents, but we can be certain that their investigations were not likely to teach them anything. They speak of the great advantage that a desire for truth will give them in studying the history of the Roman

claims and doctrines, but this means that they will be able to see the various stages in the growth of Antichrist; they do not think that any one is competent to investigate the origins of Christianity unless he first understands the doctrine of justification by faith, and they begin their address to the King of Bohemia with a reference to the fanatical and blinded men who had been hired by the devil to disfigure the truth of Christianity with philosophic trifles.

Not only did the Centuriators substitute doctrinal disquisitions for picturesque stories, but their dogmatic purpose was also shewn in another direction. A history had always been looked upon as a narrative of facts. But the narrative had now become subordinate. Instead of a continuous history the reader finds his subject divided into centuries, and in each century the matter is subdivided under fifteen headings. This method, entirely destructive of the real value of history, has been imposed upon all historians who have had their inspiration from Germany. The reader will find it (if to a modified extent) in Mosheim, in Neander and Gieseler, in the handbooks of Kurtz and Schaff.

The rival work to that of the Magdeburg Centuriators was the history of Caesar Baronius. It is one of the greatest monuments of individual diligence, of uncritical accumulation, of a blind credulity, that even the Roman Church has produced. The task was entrusted to Baronius by his superior, S. Philip Neri, when he was a young man of twenty. He worked at it with unwearied industry for fifty years, and produced thirteen folio volumes. They had an immense sale. The devout mind had complained that all that was picturesque and attractive had been banished from history; the Catholic reaction demanded an historical authority—we can chronicle so much advance—for the revival of belief

which had become fashionable. Both these desires Baronius gratified. There were few apocryphal stories that he failed to insert, even if he himself disbelieved them. No one could complain that he was prevented by any gift of the historical sense or any excessive developement of the critical faculty from being true to the Catholic faith. The confession of Peter was made at a Church council, at which he gave the first decision on matters of faith, as an example to all future pontiffs. The history of Baronius is as dogmatic as that of the Centuriators; but the dogmatism is more subtle. It is not asserted, it is implied. The narrative is constructed with the belief underlying it; but the work is a history and not a dogmatic treatise. Few ordinary readers who expected to be entertained would attack the dissertations on the doctrines of the Apostolic age which the Centuriators provide; but when they read how, in a certain year, Peter moved his chair from Antioch to Rome, they begin to think that history supports papal claims. Baronius, after all, wrote a history, and is without doubt the parent of the French school. Making use of his material, Fleury has produced the most popular and readable Church history that has appeared; and Renan, brought up in the French school and with its literary models, is almost the only critical writer who appears to have realized that the business of an historian is to write history and not a treatise on doctrine or philosophy.

Neither Protestantism nor Catholicism, engaged as they were in a life-and-death struggle, was able to realize the ideal which Erasmus had depicted—that history was to be the teacher and not the servant; that truth was to be gained by studying it, *not* that it was to be learnt in defence of truth; but the representation of two rival theories of the history of the

Church must make thoughtful minds realize that some method was necessary to decide between them, and we again find a humanist, whose Protestant training had given him a religious interest, and whose career had involved him in ecclesiastical controversies, putting once more before us the ideal of ecclesiastical history.

Isaac Casaubon had, like Erasmus, learnt in his classical training the methods and aims of criticism. "Why," he asked, "should a pagan like Polybius have realized that truth is the end of history and not Christian writers?" "History, which among the pagans has been the test of truth, amongst Christians has become the instrument of falsehood." The object of history is to give a true representation of what was taught in the beginning. The Magdeburg Centuries were often most luminous, but failed through their excessively controversial character. A true historian has three qualifications necessary for his task—diligence, judgement and good faith. No one could doubt the diligence of Baronius. It was in critical training that he was defective. Neither side, in fact, could be trusted. To one party, nothing is ancient except what they have already decided to be orthodox; to the other, everything they approve of is primitive, even the discoveries of yesterday and the day before.

Casaubon himself was in some ways the most distinguished scholar of his day. Of his critical capacity there could be no doubt. He had shewn his good faith by being willing to suffer for his opinions, and by being willing to change them. Born a Protestant he had had every inducement held out to him at the court of Henri IV. to abandon his faith, as so many of his friends had done. He had refused. He preferred to leave the books and manuscripts of Paris rather than consent. But his refusal had never been blind or prejudiced. He

had studied the Fathers, and he had studied them sufficiently to learn that an appeal to antiquity could not support the religion in which he had been brought up. He had the courage to adopt an independent attitude. He was already an old man, who had wasted on Athenaeus work which one may reasonably think might have been better spent on more edifying matter, when he approached Church history. Yet, whatever faults, or rather inadequacies, there may have been in the execution, in his *Exercitationes in Baronium* he gave a sample of true critical principles applied to the study of the Gospel narrative and early Christianity.

IV

During the century that followed, the Churches of England and France took the lead in ecclesiastical learning. The English Church, with its somewhat insular form of theology, has built itself up on the basis of history. Although the influence is hard to trace, we cannot suppose that the conservative reformation of Colet and More and Erasmus was without effect. Many of the apparent vacillations of Cranmer come as much from superior knowledge as from a weak character. The Anglican Church became what it is because its clergy studied. Mark Pattison has all the qualifications which Renan considered necessary for properly understanding it, and he assures us that

"Anglo-catholic theology is not a system of which any individual thinker can claim the invention. It came necessarily, or by natural development, out of the controversy with the papal advocates, so soon as that controversy was brought out of the domain of pure reason into that of learning. That this peculiar compromise or *via media* between Romanism and Calvinism developed itself in England and nowhere else in Christen-

dom, is owing to causes which this is not the place to investigate. But that it was a product not of English soil, but of theological learning, wherever sufficient learning existed, is evidenced by the history of Casaubon's mind, who now found himself, in 1610, an Anglican ready made, as the mere effect of reading the fathers to meet Du Perron's incessant attacks."

Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi. The leader of the school is Ussher, whose discovery of the genuine Ignatius was not a happy accident, but the result of deep and critical learning. Savile's Eton Chrysostom was probably the best edition of any one of the Fathers which had yet been published. The dispossessed clergy of the Church produced in their years of exile Bryan Walton's *Polyglott*; Hammond in his *Paraphrase* shewed how the New Testament could be treated in an historical spirit. Pearson's *Vindiciae Ignatianae* appeared in 1672, Beveridge's *Synodicon* in the same year, Cave's *Primitive Christianity* and *Lives of the Fathers and Apostles* between 1672 and 1677, Bingham's *Antiquities* 1708–22. When latitudinarianism became in the ascendant, it destroyed, as it always does, religious freedom, and the eighteenth century attracted its best minds to philosophic studies.

It is strange how the great names of English Church history have, partly by accident, partly by the necessity of their position, been attracted to the criticism of the Ignatian epistles, and the history of this controversy is the most typical of critical studies in the Fathers. The pioneer in the half-light of the middle ages was Bishop Grosseteste of Lincoln, to whom perhaps we owe the Anglo-Latin version of the genuine letters. The spurious correspondence with the Virgin vanished at once with the rise of learning. The Latin of the *Long Recension* was published in 1498, the Greek text in 1556, and pro-

duced a problem which increased in difficulty as knowledge increased. The Jesuit Petavius had doubted their integrity, but Protestants did not deny a genuine nucleus. Whitgift, Hooker, and Andrewes accepted them. Milton denounces as impiety "the confronting and paralleling the sacred verity of St. Paul with the offals and sweepings of antiquity that met as accidentally and absurdly as Epicurus his atoms to patch up a Leucippean Ignatius." Ussher published the mediaeval English-Latin version in 1644, Isaac Voss the original Greek in 1646, and the two thus solved the problem. Pearson defended the work against Daillé and the French Protestants, the genuineness was accepted by Grotius, Bull, Hammond and Le Clerc, and the question might be considered settled. But with the rise of the critical school in Germany this, like many other questions, was reopened. The discovery of the Curetonian Syriac drew a false scent across the track, and partisanship then, as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, confused the issue; and again it is one of the greatest of English scholars who has finally settled the question. If we review the whole discussion we shall find how often it is a partisan motive which has acted as a spur to critical investigators; but partisanship has never gained anything against criticism, and in the course of the controversy the true methods of historical criticism have been worked out and defined.

"The Ignatian epistles are an exceptionally good training-ground [writes Bishop Lightfoot] for the student of early Christian literature and history. They present in typical and instructive forms the most varied problems, textual, exegetical, doctrinal and historical. One who has thoroughly grasped these problems will be placed in possession of a master-key which will open to him vast storehouses of knowledge."

In the developement of critical methods the English school have taken the lead, but in magnitude of work and in literary power they fall far behind their great French rivals and friends. The list is headed by Natalis Alexander. Bossuet's *Universal History* has the reputation of being the only work of its name and character which any one would care to read. The *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques* of Du Pin, the correspondent of Archbishop Wake, is one of the most stupendous works of a single writer, and, if occasionally inaccurate, has the reputation of being among the fairest books of any age. "Integrity, love of truth, and moderation distinguish this ecclesiastical history perhaps beyond any other," is the judgement of Hallam; and perhaps it is a still greater testimony to him that, although the author was a Jansenist, a Jesuit periodical confessed that his abridgement of Church history was free from prejudice and passion: *Il est historien, il raconte et rien de plus.* If Fleury drew his matter from Baronius he did not derive his criticism from the same source, while his dissertations were far in advance of his age, the most philosophical in Church history which had yet appeared, and his style among the purest examples of the best French prose. Hallam almost grew eloquent in his praise; and Liddon thought it the best Church history which has yet been written. "It cannot be a crime," writes the former, "that these dissertations contain a great deal which, after more than a century's labour in historical inquiry, has become more familiar than it was." Tillemont is one of the writers who, like Bingham, have provided material for many since their day, and in the opinion of Renan he does not require a successor; Cotelier, editor of the *Apostolic Fathers*, reached the highest standard of accuracy yet attained in editing an ecclesiastical writer.

Our list has been a long one, but we have not yet approached the labours of the Benedictines of the congregation of S. Maur. What Erasmus had done imperfectly, what Casaubon had dreamed of, what no one until the last few years has since had the courage to attempt, they accomplished—the production of critical editions of the great Fathers of the Church. There are two preliminary stages in the study of history without which any scientific work is impossible—the correct editing of documents, and the criticism of their genuineness. The Benedictines did within these limits what the *Rolls Series* has done for English history; in doing it they first put on a scientific, or at any rate methodical, basis the subsidiary knowledge which had as yet hardly existed. Mabillon established the principles of the science of diplomatics (1681); Montfaucon of Greek palaeography (1708). What Scaliger has done for chronology was continued and widened in *L'Art de vérifier les Dates.* New documents were published by D'Achery, by Mabillon, by Martene and Durand, and by Montfaucon. Montfaucon laid the foundation of a critical study of the Hexapla, and Sabatier of the Latin versions, while the Benedictine editions of the Fathers are the delight of the collector and the armoury of the scholar. Almost the only critical work that has been done over wide areas is in the Benedictine editions. It is extraordinary how small a field the mass of later scholarship has covered.

The same vastness of conception and scale which seems only possible in the present day with the assistance of a government distinguishes a series of other works which we owe to the industry of members of the Roman Church. The *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, the collection of Church councils of Labbé, of Hardouin, and of Mansi, the Jesuit edition of the Byzantine historians which puts to shame the work of German

scholars in the same field, the liturgical collections of Renaudot, the Eastern collection of Assemani, are the indispensable assistants of every scholar; while the collections of Mai and Pitra reproduced in the nineteenth century the methods and aims—and shall we say the critical ideals?—of the Benedictine travellers and collectors of an older generation.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the universities of Holland had become the refuge of those whom the Catholic reaction had banished from other countries. The foundation of Christian and profane chronology was laid by Scaliger, who was, like Erasmus and Casaubon, a scholar of the world rather than of any particular country. The name of Grotius is great in many directions, and not least as the assertor of a true historical method in Biblical studies against a Protestant tradition which was in danger of becoming fixed. The publication of *Critici Sacri* marked the point which philological studies had attained up to 1660; while, at the end of the century, Le Clerc, who occupied a leading position as an oracle of public opinion, became the champion and defender of criticism. He was hampered, perhaps, somewhat by Protestant limitations; he found it necessary to explain with some precision the value of the study of Church history; he drew a hard and fast line between the Canon and the Fathers, but he was exact in his aims and wide in his sympathies. He republished Cotelier's *Apostolic Fathers*. He was the friend of Du Pin and of Locke, the editor of Erasmus. His history, although dry and uninteresting, is exact, scholarly and fair-minded. Yet the Dutch school was even then, perhaps, tainted with that fatal preciseness which allows but little play for the imagination, and the confusion of mind which fancies that incredulity is always synonymous with criticism.

V

Renan has told us that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries could never understand origins. Lessing tells us that "historical truth, which is accidental in character, can never become the proof of the truths of reason, which are necessary." Reason took the place of history, and controversy had worn itself out. Scholarship had ceased to be a new discovery, and therefore had lost its interest; the conflict of theologians became intolerable. Hume and Rousseau and Voltaire became the dominant forces; and the eighteenth century, which produced some great histories, contributed little to the study, or the advance, or the conception of history. A considerable number of names of ecclesiastical writers are enumerated, but there are few which would now be consulted, and none which can be said to have contributed much to the study of the subject. A student of early Christian literature may often be attracted or even compelled to consult writers of the seventeenth century; he will rarely find any one to turn to in the eighteenth. Even Mosheim belongs in many ways to an earlier epoch, and he is rather a judicious recorder than a leader. But one name may be mentioned as first asking a new question, and starting a line of future investigation. The question which Gibbon asked when he proposed five causes for the spread of Christianity first introduced a new problem, and a completely new method of treatment. To suggest that the laws of cause and effect should be applied in the region of ecclesiastical history shocked the commonplace orthodoxy of the day, and has given rationalists a considerable amount of weak-minded pleasure. But both those who feared and those who greeted the new discovery might have learnt from the philosophy of Aquinas, that in man and in nature

alike a study of causes does not take away the omnipotence of God, for God works through human and natural agencies. Gibbon was too keen-sighted not to see the limitations of his own theory, and, whatever may have been his own religious opinions, he was probably quite sincere in speaking only of secondary causes, while his somewhat severe remarks on the frailty of Christians are a useful corrective of the unreality of tone which mars so much theological literature.

To the early nineteenth century belong a number of Church histories, some of which are remembered, some forgotten; but none can be considered as marking epochs. The most prominent is that of Neander, which, published in 1824, has never been superseded, but has long been antiquated. A reader of it will admire the piety if he is wearied with the monotony of the treatment; but, when he feels how little it answers the questions which are in his mind, and how much, in some directions, later research has made it inadequate, he will be able to estimate the advance, or at any rate the change, in the study of Church history, or of its origins, since its day. It would be easy to enumerate names of writers such as that of Gieseler, who has provided many subsequent historians with original authorities; or Döllinger, whose Church history was published in 1836, but whose historical researches came afterwards; or Möhler, the leader of an older school of Roman Catholics; or Milman, who has produced the most considerable Church histories in England, but who, as is so often the case, was surpassed by many of his own country in profundity and knowledge; but it is more important to turn to the writers and events that have produced the changes in thought which have made so much in these books seem antiquated.

VI

The fourth decade of the nineteenth century—the decade of the Reform Bill and the accession of Queen Victoria—saw the beginning of two movements, both of which strongly affected and were influenced by the study of Church history. The dissertation of Baur on the history of the Christ party at Corinth, and the assize sermon of Keble, initiated movements, in many ways entirely different, both of which appealed to history; both added fresh interest to the study of Church history, and both have profoundly influenced the religious thought of the last sixty years.

It has become commonplace now to say that Baur disguised, under an appeal to history, an *a priori* method; that his inspiration was Hegelianism and not unbiassed research; that his conclusions are erroneous, and have now been shewn to be so. It is, indeed, true that hardly any leading conclusion in the domain of early Church history that he arrived at is accepted; that the dates which he or his followers assigned to the different early Christian documents are rejected, except by writers who have been blind to recent developements and discoveries; that no one can consider a contest between Ebionism and Gnosticism an adequate explanation of the origin of Christianity; yet it is equally true that the study of Baur has distinctly affected Church history. Every student of the New Testament or early Christian works will be astonished if he once realizes how the statement of almost any question which he has to discuss leads him back to Baur; and, although he will seldom accept Baur's solution, he will almost always feel that Baur's statement of the problem has illuminated the whole subject.

It is more important to ask what Baur did than where

he failed ; and the answer is summed up in stating that, if his methods were not historical, his question was historical. He asked clearly and definitely, How did it happen? It was a question which had been, perhaps, asked before, but not so clearly and with prepossessions which prevented it from being altogether understood. Baur had prepossessions, but they were such as compelled him to look on the origin of the Church as something very different from what it was supposed to be, and made him ask the question in a form which had not hitherto been suggested. A vigorous personality, and the interest of new views, created a school, and promoted the study of the origins of Christianity ; and for the last sixty years the theological mind of Germany has been discussing the questions which he raised. To enumerate the names or the schools would be a long and tedious task ; it will be more convenient to sum up at the conclusion of our survey the solid advantages which the last sixty years have brought us. For it must be confessed that much of German criticism has brought us little fruit. A very large number of writers have confined themselves within a curiously narrow range of problems, and within that range their progress has been in a circle round a fixed centre. A certain number of fixed ideas have held them tightly, and however much they may have desired to get away, it has been as impossible for them to gratify their longings as for a horse, exercised round a ring, to break out into the hunting-field. How much Baur's conclusions are modified, even by his followers, may be seen in the last edition of Weizsäcker's *History of the Apostolic Age*, or the dates of Jülicher's *Introduction*.

While Germany produced a movement, it has produced little that is permanent. The same critical wave in France has contributed one good history. There is, of

course, much that Renan has written which will be profoundly distasteful to every devout or even serious mind. There is an element in his writings which we would gladly eliminate. Yet his merits are very great. He took his criticism from Germany. It would have been much better had he lived twenty years later; yet it is interesting to notice the literary tact—and Renan has much of that tact—which makes him modify extravagant theories. The introductions to his several volumes are always lucid, and often just. But it is in narrative that he excels, for he has realized that history should narrate, and that it deals with persons and places as well as with ideas. The German historian represents the early history of the Church as a succession of metaphysical and philosophical theories, and the world in which they are propounded also as a world of theories. No doubt it is perfectly true that the history of Christianity is that of an idea, or ideas; but those ideas were always exhibited through the medium of persons, and those persons were largely influenced by the external conditions under which they lived. If we read the history of Weizsäcker we never get free from the criticism of sources: we are always recalled to some real or imaginary contentions and parties: the name of Antioch recalls nothing but the dispute with Peter; but Renan banishes his discussions to an introduction, and the mention of Antioch leads to a brilliant description of the city on the Orontes, which played so great a part in Christian history. Persons, with Weizsäcker, are masks with dogmatic opinions; with Renan they are the living agents in the spread of Christianity, with all the marks of personal distinction. If Christianity is an idea it is also a force building up individual character and revealed in life, not merely confined to abstractions. No Church history will fulfil its purpose that does not tell, with all

the wealth of illustration that modern knowledge has provided, the story of Christianity.

About the same year which saw the beginning of the Tübingen school of theology saw the beginning of a very different movement in Oxford. It is a common judgement to say that the Tübingen school was historical, the Oxford school dogmatic, and to contrast the latter unfavourably with the former. Baur sought to find truth: Newman to defend error. But both judgements are only half true. It was the study of history which taught the founders of the Oxford Movement, if it was also the dread of rationalism. Newman was brought up in a very different theology; he studied the records of the early Church, and a new world of thought and ideas was revealed to him. Evangelicalism and liberalism had both made up their minds that, whatever might be true, the system called Catholic was not. Newman approached the records of the early centuries, and found Catholicism exhibited; and the world was astonished to find that the historic record, which it imagined was Rome's greatest enemy, seemed to say much for it. His followers have gone in very different directions; but when he won W. G. Ward by the statement that Catholicism could never have developed out of modern Protestantism, he was really setting in his way the same problem that Baur set so differently.

A writer in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* has told us that the "tractarian movement has stimulated a certain amount of antiquarian research." This is a very inadequate judgement. It roused a very keen, if one-sided, interest in Church history, and a considerable amount of work in editing and translating the Fathers, in studying and illustrating the history of their period. Newman's *Arians* is not in the first rank of historical literature, but it is a very remarkable and penetrating

book. The work begun was never completed. *The Library of the Fathers* and the *Bibliotheca Patrum* were never finished. Yet the movement developed men of great power in many directions. One of them, who became the historian of the events in which he had played a part, exhibits a perfect historical discipline and temper. It largely influenced the greatest English historians; it produced the scholastic enthusiasm of Mark Pattison. The school was broken up. Rome attracted some; rationalism others. Practical work more and more absorbed those who remained. Academic liberalism, the most sterile of all modern creeds, cast its shadow over Oxford. But the interest that was aroused in the problems of early Christianity has not died, and men have begun to realize that Catholic Christianity, whether Roman or Anglican, is not merely the offspring of ignorance and prejudice.

VII

Our review has revealed to us ecclesiastical history as the prey of controversial interests as much in the nineteenth as in the sixteenth century, although the questions are wider and the problems more complex. Scholars are, at any rate, beginning to ask the question, "How did Christianity arise? What was Christianity like?" Not, "What proofs are there for Catholics or Protestants?" But are there no scholars on whom the mantle of Erasmus or Casaubon has descended?

The strife of contending opinions has made the need of scientific investigation more and more apparent, and three different schools in England, France, and Germany have developed in a distinguished degree historical methods. One is Anglican, a second Romanist, a third

Protestant or rationalist in its origin. With one is associated the name of Lightfoot, with the second that of Duchesne, with the third that of Harnack. It is not necessary to dwell in this country on the work of Lightfoot or of those associated with him. There may be some who are attracted more by the subtlety and versatility of Hort; but there is a greatness in the profound simplicity of Lightfoot to which Hort does not rise. We must judge men by their productions; and the edition of the New Testament is not the equal of what Harnack calls the greatest patristic monograph of the century—a monograph which has been the most important factor in changing the current of critical opinion.

The Abbé Duchesne has preserved the French neatness and lightness of touch; the edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* is a work of the most exact and scientific scholarship, and the *Histoire du Culte Chrétien* is the most luminous and cultivated work on the history of the Church services. His name may be taken as representative of a cultivated and liberal school of Romanist students who in France and South Germany are investigating the Bible and Church history in a scientific spirit.

If the Anglican appears sometimes in Lightfoot, the Papist in Duchesne, Professor Harnack is as clearly possessed of prejudices, and is certainly inferior to the other two in judgement, in balance of mind and in critical methods; he is superior to both in fertility of thought and creativeness of ideas. He has succeeded in transforming the temper and methods of modern German theology, and lifted it out of the rut in which it was getting fixed. He has laid down clearly and well for the benefit of English readers the qualifications of an ecclesiastical historian:

"In taking up a theological book we are in the habit of inquiring first of all as to the author's point of view. In an historical work there is no need for such inquiry. The question is whether the author is in sympathy with the subject about which he writes, whether he can distinguish original elements from those that are derived, whether he has a thorough acquaintance with his material, whether he is aware of the limits of historical knowledge, and whether he is truthful. These requirements constitute the categorical imperative for the historian; but they can only be fulfilled by an unwearied self-discipline. Hence any historical study is an ethical task. The historian ought to be faithful in every sense of the word: whether he has been so or not is the question on which his readers have to decide."

What is striking about Professor Harnack is the width of his reading and the interest that he takes in literature which is not German—a great change in itself. He is honourably distinguished for the frankness and honesty with which he admits that he has been wrong. As his opportunities have increased, his conceptions and aims have grown larger. The *Texte und Untersuchungen* implied that the dogmatic and speculative methods of the older German school were to be given up, and that research for the future was to begin with documents. In the *Chronology of Christian Literature* the test of genuineness and date is placed primarily in external evidence rather than on the internal ideas, which rarely fail to be subjective. The new edition of ante-Nicene writers is an enterprise worthy of the Benedictines and the Berlin Academy.

The existence of these three schools, approaching the same problems by the same methods, but from very different starting-points, is the best guarantee for the future of Church history and the developement of an historical theology. Yet the example of Erasmus warns

us that the future will always be very different from what scholars long for, and that they must be content with knowing that their influence will be a secret force that modifies the movements which passion, and prejudice, and material needs arouse.[1]

VIII

An attempt has been made in the preceding pages to review the lines upon which the study of Church history has progressed. Two questions remain. What definite advance has there been in the subject in recent years? And what methods and principles are suggested by the review which has just been concluded?

There are three main divisions in the study of history—the collection and publication of material, the criticism of documents, and finally the constructive work which is the end and result of the previous studies, the narrative of events and the picture of life in past time. Under the first heading it is wonderful how large have been, and continue to be, the gleanings

[1] It is ten years since the above was written and some few words must be said of the last decade. It has witnessed in the Roman Church the rise and, it is to be feared, the fall of Modernism, a movement which touched the problem of Church history with a criticism inspired by a fearless faith. It has witnessed an investigation inspired by historical methods on the part of Roman theologians into English Orders. In both cases historical truth has been brutally overthrown by the unintelligent employment of authority. Mgr. Duchesne remains the leading figure of Church history in the Roman Church, but his influence is confined to the study of archaeology and the writing of his History, which shews all a French grace and acutely evades dangerous points. In Germany Harnack is still supreme, and there is no new name of note to record. Meanwhile Harnack is strengthening steadily the conservative tendency of much modern criticism. In England we have to record the publication of Dr. Bright's *Age of the Fathers*, the ablest work in Church history of the decade, the last product of the Oxford Movement; but the younger English school has hardly accomplished what might ten years ago have been expected.

of recent years. Even the younger among us have seen large additions made to our material for studying the origins of Christianity, and have felt the thrill of interest which is one of the indirect advantages of a new discovery. It is hardly necessary to give a catalogue of what is well known. One instance will suffice. Let any one compare the volume of the writings of Hippolytus published by the Berlin Academy with the editions of Fabricius or even Lagarde, and he will realize the advance that has been made. A new manuscript found in the Levant, an old Slavonic version for the first time brought to light, fragments in many languages from all the libraries of Europe, catenae properly examined and edited, have all contributed to its enrichment. This is only one and not the most obvious instance. And not only have new documents been discovered, but also those which we already possessed can be presented in a very much better form. When Bishop Lightfoot produced his first edition of the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, he had only the one Greek manuscript which had been used by his predecessors for two hundred years, a manuscript imperfect and in many places undecipherable. Since that time a second Greek manuscript, a Syriac and a Latin version have been added to our materials, and the text, then most uncertain, is now made by these very varied authorities in most places absolutely trustworthy. And these discoveries have a further interest. The suspicion sometimes suggests itself to a critical student of the history of the early Church, that the texts which we possess have been tampered with. The suspicion is not ungrounded, for instances could be named in which this has happened. But the gradual extension of the material which we possess compels us in almost all

cases to lay aside such suspicions. In classical books we rarely possess more than one class of testimony, that of Greek or Latin manuscripts, as the case may be; in the case of Christian writings we can often add, especially in the case of the earlier and more important documents, the testimony of versions necessarily made at an early date. The limits within which any tampering with the text is scientifically possible are very small.

To the fresh information obtained by the study of documents must be added the results of archaeological research. There are few names that deserve a higher place in the record of Church history than that of De Rossi. As a sagacious explorer and a keen-sighted investigator he has added a chapter to our knowledge, and has exhibited in a high degree soundness of judgement. It is true, indeed, that, among a very large number of conclusions, there are some which will not stand, and that his fault is credulity rather than incredulity; but he is far more trustworthy than his English and German critics, whose very far-fetched theories and conjectures do not command assent. His discoveries were not indeed new, but he first introduced an element of scientific method into researches into the catacombs. In another direction archaeology has introduced a completely new source of information, and the inscriptions of Asia Minor which have been discovered and illustrated with very great acuteness by Sir William Ramsay of Aberdeen have added both to our information and conception of early Christianity. It is possible, without accepting all the methods and conclusions of *St. Paul the Traveller*, to be grateful for the new material provided for us, and to admire the brilliancy and originality with which it has been illustrated.

Our sources of information have increased; but how have we edited and used them? The work done has

been singularly disproportionate; but textual criticism has been made into a science, and it only remains to apply accepted methods over a wider field. How important this may be, many who write on Church history fail to realize. They consider the labour expended in forming a correct text thrown away, and do not trouble to make use of its conclusions. There are, of course, editors who seem almost to regard a correct text as an end instead of a means; but a moment's thought will shew us that unless our documents are given in the most correct form possible we may as well give up considering that there is any connexion between truth and history; and an instance will shew how far-reaching may be the effects of an apparently small corruption.

When Pearson defended the Ignatian letters his work was recognized by competent critics to be conclusive; but there was one weak spot which the more exact among his opponents detected, and of which he was himself fully conscious. In one passage the text in the then known manuscripts contained the following expression: "the Eternal Word who came not forth from Silence."[1] This expression, it may be stated, avoiding as much as possible technicalities, described the Son of God as the Eternal Word who did not proceed as an emanation from *Sige* (Silence). It seemed, in fact, to be directly combating the teaching of the well-known heretic Valentinus, who had attempted to explain the universe as the result of a series of emanations from the Deity, in which the Divine attributes were personified. These emanations were called Aeons, and from one of them, *Sige*, or Silence, had come forth the Word, or *Logos*. Now Valentinus lived later than the supposed date of Ignatius, and this passage was, therefore, urged as an argument against the genuineness of the epistles.

[1] λόγος ἀΐδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών.

Pearson's defence was learned, but not conclusive. But Bishop Lightfoot was able to point out that the oriental versions shewed that the correct text should be "the Word from Silence,"[1] leaving out the negative. This expression meant that the Divine revelation of the Word came to break the Silence and Ignorance in which the world lay. The expression had nothing to do with Valentinianism; but at a later date it was considered to favour it, and so a later copyist altered it. So far from the expression in its correct form being indicative of a late date, it implies an early date. The writer of the epistles could never have used it if there had been any fear of its having an heretical sound. Whatever else he may have been, he was, according to his knowledge, strongly orthodox.

It has been worth while to dwell somewhat long on what may seem a mere detail, because of the principles that it illustrates. In the first place it makes it clear how absolutely essential to the study of a document in at all a scientific spirit is a correct text. The variation may seem small, but its effect may be very great. There are a certain number of crucial instances which could be added; every scholar might contribute some. The interest in the text may indeed become too absorbing, and deadening to higher interests. There has been a tendency to make textual criticism take too prominent a place in theological education; but, if truth be the end of our investigations, no brilliancy will be of any value, if we have not sound and good texts to work on. However great may be the labour from them, it is necessary. A second point that this instance illustrates is the limits within which our texts are trustworthy. There is no doubt that interpolations and corruptions have existed, and quotations might be made

[1] λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς.

from early writers to prove it. The anathema at the end of the Revelation is not isolated. How far, then, can we trust our texts? The answer is, that, where they rest on a single authority, the reading may be in any isolated passage or statement doubtful; but where there are many different lines of tradition, as, for example, in these Ignatian letters, the danger of undetected corruption is almost non-existent. But, thirdly, the same instance suggests a very important point which may bear on future investigation. Pearson, when he published his *Vindiciae Ignatianae* made it quite clear that all the balance of argument was in favour of the genuineness of the epistles; yet here was undeniably a difficulty which might furnish an argument to his opponents. There are some minds so constituted that they allow a single difficulty to overpower a dozen good arguments. Yet this instance—and many others like it might be quoted—ought to shew us that single difficulties generally arise from defective knowledge. Good criticism does not consist in discovering a single flaw and rejecting the document accordingly, but in balancing the evidence and then arriving at a conclusion which future research or discovery will corroborate. Our knowledge is always imperfect, and in that lies the difficulty of the subject.

The principles of textual criticism have been put on a scientific basis. Some few works have been adequately edited. It remains to apply them to those many other works whose texts are often imperfect. But what of the higher criticism, as it is the fashion to call it? Has there been any real advance in material? Are we more certainly able to distinguish the false and the true? The advance has been twofold. First, every book of the New Testament and of early Christian literature has been doubted; and secondly,

the period of confusion thus created is now coming to an end. Until the genuineness of a book has been doubted, until every argument that can be discovered against it by some one with an interested motive has been brought forward, there will probably be no scientific grounds for pronouncing it genuine. The first benefit, then, that all the various movements of the last sixty years have conferred is that there is no conceivable hypothesis which has not been put forward, and no view, however untenable, which has not been defended by some writer. There is much controversy which may have seemed almost fruitless, yet it has not been so; for, although learned opinion may have ultimately reverted to the point from which it started, yet the old opinions are held in a very different way. The same opinion may prevail now concerning the genuineness of S. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians as prevailed before it was questioned, yet our point of view is very much changed. This much, then, at any rate, has been gained. Every conceivable theory has been suggested, every point of criticism raised. If a document is still accepted, it is not blindly. But, secondly, everything having been thrown into confusion, reason and order are now being restored. In 1885, in his preface to the first edition of the Ignatian letters, Bishop Lightfoot wrote: "To the disciples of Baur the rejection of the Ignatian Epistles is an absolute necessity of their theological position. The ground would otherwise be withdrawn from under them, and their reconstructions of early Church history would fall in ruins on their heads." It has taken just about ten years to make this clear to scholars; it will take some little time longer to convince those writers who are so ready to inform English theologians how antiquated are their methods and how ignorant they are of the newest speculations.

It is as well to emphasize the general agreement with which that work has been greeted. Harnack first accepted the genuineness, but doubted the date ; he now accepts the results as fully established. His pupil Von der Goltz, investigating the question from another side, has strengthened Lightfoot's position. M. J. Réville, in France, who has written a somewhat speculative work on the origin of the Christian ministry, accepts Lightfoot's conclusions as axiomatic. When Dr. Fairbairn said that Dr. Lightfoot, by the mass and masterliness of his learning, had overborne judgement rather than carried conviction, we can only feel surprise at a remark which casts discredit, not on the author, but on his critic. If the letters of Ignatius, Polycarp and Clement are genuine, then it follows that there must have existed before them a Christian literature similar to that contained in the Canon. It is not merely that these writings testify to individual books of the New Testament, although this testimony is considerable—the Johannine literature, most of S. Paul's Epistles, and a Gospel narrative are implied ; it is that the theology and Christian life represented in them will be conceivable if the canonical literature represents the first century, but will not be so otherwise. On the basis of ordinary laws of historical research it forms an adequate and substantial cause. The preface of Harnack's *Chronology of Early Christian Literature*, which in the main outline and in most of the details restores to us the traditional dates for the greater part of early Christian literature, is not a mere *jeu d'esprit* by a vigorous writer, but is the necessary and logical outcome of the acceptance of the Ignatian letters, and of working out the problem by a sound scientific method.

Another force which has been working in the same direction is the influence of secular research represented

by such writers as Professor Mommsen, Sir William Ramsay, and, we might add, Professor Blass. Again and again in ecclesiastical history a return to truer methods, sometimes in one direction, sometimes in another, has been due to the influence of humanist studies. It was so in the case of Erasmus; it was so in the case of Casaubon. The reason is natural. In classical literature, sound methods can be developed with comparatively little injury from controversial bias. In theology and ecclesiastical history there is always a motive, positive or negative. When Professor Mommsen approached a document like the Acts of the Apostles he did so in quite a different spirit from that of a rationalist critic. He wishes to make what he can of the document; the rationalist critic thinks that he shews his criticism by discovering mistakes. When Professor Ramsay took up the Acts of the Apostles as a geographical document he began gradually to discover that it bore all the marks of being written by some one acquainted with the district he describes: when he finds a difficulty he seeks an explanation; he does not begin by assuming that there is a mistake, or that he knows more about the first century than his documents. Of course, in both cases, an error may be discovered, but judgement is required in estimating the inference to be drawn from a single mistake. In almost all cases where he has touched on Church history Professor Mommsen introduced scientific methods, and brushed away the cobwebs.

Recent years have, in fact, produced a great change in criticism. It is due partly to a change of method, the substitution of the scientific for the *a priori*; it is due largely to the influence of Bishop Lightfoot's *Ignatius*; and it is due also to the work on Church history done by secular historians. Recognizing this, it

may be convenient to ask what are the accepted results? What points are accepted we cannot say universally, for there will always be individual eccentricities, but by the great majority of critics of different schools?

Of the Pauline Epistles ten may be accepted. Professor Harnack has some doubts about Ephesians; but they will probably vanish, and other critics who are not too old to learn will have to fall in with him. Of the exact date there will always be a certain amount of dispute, for we have not the materials for constructing a certain chronology. The Pastoral Epistles are still under dispute. Whatever a critic's personal opinion may be, he cannot appeal to them as undoubted documents. The favourite theory at present is to see in them evidence of interpolation; there is a genuine Pauline nucleus which has been added to. The advantage of this theory is that it enables the early quotations from the Epistles to be explained, and the evidence for what is supposed to be an advanced ecclesiastical organization eliminated. The Epistle to the Hebrews is certainly by some one who had come under the influence of S. Paul, and is certainly earlier than the letters of Clement. It is placed by Harnack in the reign of Domitian, and cannot be later.

Passing to other groups of writings, the Acts and S. Luke's Gospel must have been written by a companion of S. Paul, and cannot be later than the year 90 A.D. The other two synoptic Gospels date probably from the years 65–75; but the existence of late additions cannot be disproved, although it may be doubted. Not later than the age of Domitian must come the First Epistle of S. Peter. The theory of Harnack that the name of Peter was added by a later forger is hardly likely to gain credence. Christian tradition is now being again accepted, and the Apocalypse is placed

in the reign of Domitian; while the other Johannine writings cannot be placed later than the year 110. Who wrote them? What is their historic value? These remain questions on which there is not yet agreement. The same may be said of the date of the Second Epistle of S. Peter and the Epistles of S. Jude and S. James. It is obvious, however, that, so far as these last are concerned, however interesting they may be, they are not indispensable for constructing a history of Christian developement.

To write early Christian history, putting aside documents which can only be used with hesitation and caution, we have the following groups:

(1) The accepted Pauline letters belonging to the years 45–60.

(2) A group of writings belonging to the next generation, 60–90: the three synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the First Epistle of S. Peter.

(3) The Johannine writings, which cannot be later than the year 110.

(4) The Apostolic Fathers, representing the beginning, and the Apologists, the middle of the second century.

(5) The great ante-Nicene writers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Clement, Origen, besides many less-known names (180–230).

Later than this we need not go, for later there has never been any substantial doubt about the writings which may be used. The above list up to that date, omitting, of course, minor fragments, represents the fixed documents which a writer has to go upon in attempting so far as he can to build up Church history on a secure foundation.

A third division of our subject remains. How far has this historical reconstruction been carried? Here the

deficiency is very marked. When it was stated that the history of Neander was antiquated, but had never been superseded, the want of a history of the early Church was implied. There is no such book. The reason is obvious. The course of criticism had thrown the whole subject into confusion, and a great deal of preliminary work had to be done again. Lightfoot had dreamed of writing a history of Christian literature, but his labour on the Apostolic Fathers consumed all his powers. But, although no Church history has been written which can claim to be authoritative, much preliminary work of a very valuable character has been accomplished, and to enumerate it will be the best survey of the actual gains of the labours of recent years.

First, we may, I think, put the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. It is, of course, unequal, as such works must necessarily be, but it has gained almost universal acceptance both in England and abroad. It has made almost all work infinitely easier, for it has summed up in every direction the research of the last fifty years. Its companion volumes, the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, are of less value ; and most would prefer to consult the dictionary of Kraus, to whom we owe by far the best history of Christian art. For the history of Christian worship we have Duchesne's *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, and the first volume of Brightman's *Liturgies*, a book which, referring principally to a later age, is indispensable for the study of the earliest period ; for the beginning of Christian worship can only be understood if its later developements are known.

In another direction a correct conception of the origin and growth of Christianity has been facilitated by the knowledge that we have acquired of the history of its environment. The combination of legal, of antiquarian and historical knowledge, the discovery and investiga-

tion of inscriptions and of coins, the immense labour expended upon the copies of Latin inscriptions, all associated with the name of Professor Mommsen, have given us an intimate knowledge of the life and constitution of the Roman empire, of all the conditions under which Christianity rose and opened. A knowledge of contemporary Judaism is even more essential, and for that Schürer has systematized an immense mass of work, and scholarly editions are appearing of many of the apocryphal writings. We are still asking for some one to make Philo intelligible, and for some master hand which may sift for us the wheat from the chaff in that strange and unapproachable subject, rabbinical literature.

It would be beside our purpose to enumerate all the special editions, monographs and investigations which have appeared. They are of varying merit, and often not final. Conspicuous among them are the investigations which Professor Harnack throws out with such amazing fertility. Their conclusions often need correcting, but their collection of material is admirable. His chronological investigations are not by any means always sound, but he is the first who has attempted for long to construct a comprehensive scheme. His introduction to Christian literature has replaced Fabricius, while his *Dogmengeschichte*, as summing up a series of monographs and the conclusions of the long line of German histories, may form an adequate basis for future investigators with saner views. It is often the mission of Harnack to suggest theories that others may refute them, but those who least agree with him will often have learnt most from his writings; he is only dangerous to his own followers.

If the time ever comes when a good history is written with all the advantages of modern research, it will be

much better than anything which has yet appeared. Yet, to put together the result of all this labour, and to write a book which should within a readable compass tell us how Christianity came into the world, what the message that it had to give sounded like when it was first preached, what were the meanings of the words and ideas used, how it gradually gained depth and took form as the Christian Church, would be a task of the very greatest difficulty. The Church historian will have to possess great diligence, complete knowledge, critical acumen; he should have a philosophic temper and spirit; he should possess a wide acquaintance with classical antiquity and with the hopes and aspirations of Judaism; he must have a calm and judicial and believing mind. Renan told us that we could not write the history of a religion unless we had first believed in it and then ceased to do so. That might be correct if Christianity were already proved to be untrue, but not otherwise. We must distinguish investigation and construction. If he investigates the history of Christianity a man cannot hope to be unbiassed: his early training must influence him; but whether he start from belief or unbelief he must at any time be prepared to ask himself the question, Is this true or is it not? remembering that whatever be his hopes the issue at stake is tremendous, and that he will neither wish to believe without good evidence or to disbelieve what perhaps after all may be true. That is the temper in which to investigate.

But when the constructive history begins he must have made up his mind, and if as the result of his investigations he finds that there are good grounds for believing in the truth of Christianity, then the true temper in which to write is that of the man who believes, believes simply and honestly and reverently, but who has looked disbelief in the face, and can exhibit

in his style and thought the chastened mind which realizes and sympathizes with and understands the opinions of those from whom he differs. He must always write as an historian and not as a controversialist. He must write so that his history may be accepted even by those who do not share his beliefs.

IX

There are two special difficulties in Church history of the early periods: one is the poverty of the material, the other is the peculiar character of the subject-matter. The fact that it is connected with present needs in a way which exposes it in a special degree to the dangers of a controversial treatment, and that it deals with a subject-matter which claims to be supernatural and is believed to be so by the great majority of those interested in it, makes agreement difficult, and demands great care in investigation.

It is recognized at once that fairness of mind and freedom from prejudice are required. A history written with the object of proving that Anglicanism or Protestantism or Romanism is true would be admitted to be prejudiced. A writer who begins by assuming the truth of Christianity will probably end by proving it. These propositions would generally be admitted, but the complement to them is, curiously enough, ignored. Strange as it may seem, it is necessary to point out that to assume that any form of Christianity is untrue, or that the supernatural is impossible, or that some particular form of thought which is not orthodox is true—any of these assumptions is equally a sign of prejudice. The difference in conclusion between orthodox and unorthodox investigators is often very great, and it is sometimes assumed that all the bias is on the

side of the orthodox. A very few quotations will shew that this is not the case.

In one of his early essays, an essay written at a time when he was collecting his material for his *Vie de Jésus*, Renan writes: "Criticism has two methods of attacking a story which contains a miraculous element; for as to accepting the history as it is, that is impossible, since the very essence of criticism is the negation of the supernatural." Here is a definite statement that his researches were started on the assumption that the miraculous cannot be true. Is it marvellous, then, that he succeeds in proving that these assumptions were correct? Is it any more marvellous than that the Christian apologist succeeds in proving that *his* assumptions also are correct? The latter is supposed to be prejudiced; why not the former? The above statement is followed by a note to the effect that the only true use of the word "rationalist" is of a person who studies Jewish or Christian literature without any presuppositions at all. Quite so. But it is as much a dogmatic presupposition to disbelieve as to believe. Research asks whether a thing is or is not true. It does not begin by assuming that it is not so. The fault of Renan was not, of course, that after investigation he wrote with the presupposition that Christianity is untrue, but that he confesses that he even investigated with a conclusion ready formed, and considers that it is the province of criticism to do so. His method is vitiated from the beginning.

The article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* on Church history will give us another instance. "No one," it is said, "will expect scientific Church history from a Roman Catholic." If a Roman Catholic were to preface his remarks by saying, "No one would expect scientific history from a Protestant," he would be called bigoted and prejudiced; yet the two remarks are exactly of

equal value. Both, of course, assume that certain conclusions must be necessarily false; and if we appeal to our history of the subject we shall find that there is very little ground for believing the one more than the other. It is, of course, true that an immense mass of historical writing which is thoroughly unscientific has been produced by Romanists; but the same is certainly true of Protestant writers. Science means a capacity for arriving at correct conclusions, and certainly in many cases the ultimate decision has not been in favour of what we may call the orthodox Protestant history. A dislike of episcopacy produced vigorous attacks on the Ignatian letters, but those attacks have not been sustained. Opposition to the papal claims caused the visit of S. Peter to Rome to be doubted—certainly against the balance of probability, as is now being recognized. Bunsen was a very aggressive and assertive champion of Protestantism, yet his opinions concerning Hippolytus were certainly less scientific than those of his Roman Catholic antagonist. The conclusions of hundreds of writers who would claim to be scientific have been proved to be incorrect, and often absurd; while Du Pin, Tillemont, Hefele and Duchesne, are all in the front rank of scientific historians. It is not necessary to accept the opinions of these writers on all points, or to believe that every statement of theirs is correct, or that they have sufficient evidence to justify their historical position in every case; what is maintained is that they have as great a right to be called scientific historians as any one else who has written on ecclesiastical history. Nor, again, is it necessary to deny that there have been a number of exceedingly uncritical and unscientific writers in the Roman Church from the days of Baronius to the present time; but few statements that they have made are more uncritical—or

shall we say ignorant?—than that of Daillé, which ascribed the rise of episcopacy to the third century, or that of a Dutch writer who asserts that the Ignatian letters were the work of a Cynic philosopher.

The fact is that the word scientific is used in all these cases in a quite incorrect manner. A scientific history is supposed to mean one the conclusions of which are in accordance with what are imagined to be the conclusions of science. A history which proves that miracles did not exist, or that evolution—a word very loosely used—will account for the rise of Christianity, is considered scientific, however incorrect its methods may be, because its conclusion is believed to be in accordance with science; an historian who is Roman Catholic is supposed to be unscientific because his conclusions are unscientific. But the only true meaning of the word "scientific" must be that of a scientific method. Science never gets beyond the investigation and arrangement of facts even in its own domain; its explanations and hypotheses are not scientific, and the philosophy reared upon those explanations is as much in the air as any more credulous system. A similar criticism is suggested by the use of the word "historical" in a school of writers who are represented in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*. Their motto is that Christianity is to be investigated like any other religion; their practice is to assume that it has already been found to have no higher claim on the human race than any other creed. Their motto is quite true: their practice is inconsistent with it, or rather they are guilty of a confusion of thought. The only historical method of studying Christian origins is to begin by studying documents according to ordinary historical rules, without any presumptions, negative or positive. A negative prejudice is just as likely to vitiate our conclusions as a positive one.

It would be tedious to enumerate other instances at length. Dr. Hatch is claimed to be an unbiassed writer. He had indeed great claims on our respect as a very industrious investigator; but when he states in the Hibbert Lectures that his purpose is to explain how the Nicene Creed developed out of the Sermon on the Mount, he is guilty of great confusion of thought, and he sets the problem in a manner which begs the question to be discussed. There were other elements in the New Testament out of which the Nicene Creed developed, and arbitrarily to select the Sermon on the Mount as typical of the teaching of our Lord is to assume a one-sided view of the Christian revelation. The value of the book, which is considerable, is largely vitiated by this incorrect and biassed assumption. In Professor Harnack's writings a similar bias is often latent. His purpose is not an attack on Christianity, as has been unjustly supposed, but an attempt to reduce Christianity to what he believes to be its primitive simplicity, in order to take away the supposed difficulty of accepting it; to banish, in fact, ecclesiasticism, catholicism and the supernatural in order to preserve its spiritual significance. This is not the place to discuss the question how far legitimate or wise that aim may be: our only purpose is to recognize the existence of a bias both positive and negative in the study of Christian history, and to guard ourselves against both.

It may be thought that too much stress has been laid on this point; but any knowledge of current criticism will correct that view. There is a very common theory that belief is biassed and unbelief is not biassed; that if a man writes in favour of episcopacy he is prejudiced, that if he writes against it he is not so; that no Roman Catholic can see things clearly, but that most Protestants can; that if a man starts with the belief that there is

nothing in Christianity he is historical, that if he assumes the latest theory of science he is scientific. But no one can claim freedom from bias. Bias is inherent in our nature. All our conclusions can be only modifications of inherited views. What a writer and investigator can do is to make an effort to exhibit always "good faith," to be true to himself and to others, and to devote himself to acquiring so far as he can a scientific method. In matters of history mathematical demonstration is almost always an impossibility; it is seldom that anything can be proved, and therefore what is essential is a trained judgement. It should acquire its method so far as possible by being trained on classical and other models; and it should add to that an ethical discipline. An ecclesiastical historian must have the trained habits of the scholar, and he must have the capacity of self-criticism and self-judgement. We cannot hope that every one will agree: the starting-point of many minds is too different; but the general influence of good methods of study will make agreement much more possible. It is not the most educated that differ most.

X

The second cause of the difficulty of early Church history is the scantiness of the evidence in comparison with the importance of the question. The study of origins is always fascinating and always uncertain. There must always, of course, be many doubtful facts in history, because there are many events of which the true cause was not known even to contemporaries, or no contemporary written account has come down to us. With regard to Christianity, the history of its origin is certainly in a better position than that of any other religion, for we know the historical setting in which it

appeared. The history of Judaism and the history and organization of the Empire in the first century are better known than any other period in the ancient world. Even of the origin of Christianity the evidence is fuller and more certainly authentic than that of the beginnings of most similar movements. Compare, for example, what we know of the beginnings of Buddhism, and notice how slight it is. But yet, on many questions to which we desire an answer, the evidence is very slight, the arguments either way are not conclusive, and therefore personal bias and religious conviction will always operate strongly. Did S. John the Apostle live and die in an old age at Ephesus? The arguments for it are strong, but they are not conclusive. Our opinion on the subject must almost necessarily be influenced by extraneous considerations. What is the origin of episcopacy? How easy it is when the evidence is so conflicting for the final conclusion to be the result of convictions already formed! What was the position of the Bishop of Rome in the first three centuries? It is easy to state the same facts very differently, according to our bias. Different opinions in succession may seem plausible, and, as Dr. Hort is reported to have said concerning the genuineness of the Second Epistle of S. Peter, "one reads all the arguments against its genuineness, and is convinced; and then, after all, one begins to doubt one's conclusion."

What is the best method of avoiding the uncertainty caused by this absence of conclusive evidence? Is there any way of limiting at all the personal bias? One method may be suggested as a wise one to pursue—that of advancing from the known to the unknown. The great advance in the study of Roman constitutional history has been made by working back from the known and developed constitution of the later republican and

imperial time to the earlier periods. In a similar way the only true method for the study of Church history is to start from the developed constitution and work back to the earlier period. Modern investigation has generally started from the most obscure. The real method of setting the problem should be: We know what Christianity was like in the fourth century; we know very fairly well what it was like at the end of the second: we have to interpret the more fragmentary remains of an earlier period in a way which will explain and account for the later developements. There must be caution in such an investigation. We must be on our guard against reading the mind of the late age into the earlier; we must correct ourselves by looking at events from other points of view; but we shall at any rate arrive at a picture of the Church of the Apostolic age much less incongruous with its future developements than some of the theories which have been propounded.

This discussion has been prolonged far enough. Its object has been to shew that there has been definite advance in the study of Church history; that this advance has arisen from the substitution of the historical for the controversial method of writing, and by applying to theological studies the scientific methods which are developed and learnt in the study of classical subjects. The ecclesiastical historian cannot be free from bias, but he can make every effort to be honest and scientific in his researches, and can trust that, by the gradual progress of knowledge and the conflict of different opinions, a truer method and conclusions more certain and more largely agreed upon will be arrived at. The fabric of knowledge is built up by the work of many schools and many writers, and all work, if it be true and honest, will contribute to the final result.

VIII

THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS[1]

"THE historical investigation of the Origines of Christianity is a study scarcely second in importance to a philosophical arrangement of its doctrines." So wrote the late Mark Pattison. There have been periods when the investigation of the early history of the Church has been neglected; this is not a fault of which theologians at the present day can be accused. If they are guilty at all, it is of an excessive and not always well-directed vigour. They have become so fertile in contradictory hypotheses, they are so intent on their private subjects of dispute, they have loaded their works with such a mass of technicalities as to produce in the mind of the ordinary reader a feeling of bewilderment, of confusion and uncertainty. Every fact is disputed, however unreasonably; every document is controverted, however inadequate may be the grounds, by some school or historian. The intelligent spectator can find no standing-place, and turns away disappointed from a study which he feels ought to be full of interest, but which an excessive difference of opinion has made almost as barren to him as mediaeval or Protestant scholasticism, as the origin of the English Manor, or the tactics of the battle of Hastings. Such an attitude

First published in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 364, October 1895.

is not really justified. There are solid attainable facts even in early Church history, and that there are such is due above all to the labours of a great English scholar. Bishop Lightfoot was one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of modern English bishops, but he was more than that; he was not only the munificent administrator of a populous northern diocese, adapting the Church of the past to the needs and aspirations of the present, but he also occupied a foremost position among the investigators of Christian Antiquity. It is the purpose of this essay, making use of the definite results that Dr. Lightfoot arrived at, results which the lapse of time since his death has only served to establish more surely, to construct so far as we are able a picture of Christianity at its most obscure and crucial epoch, the beginning of the second century. We believe that in doing so we shall be performing a by no means useless task, for Bishop Lightfoot's works, although he writes throughout in a singularly clear and attractive style, and marshals an intricate subject with great skill, deal of necessity so largely in the technicalities of scholarship as to confuse an untrained reader. We purpose, therefore, first to estimate his place in the study of Ecclesiastical History, and then to indicate the conclusions which in our opinion he has established.

There have been three periods in the study of Church history. At the dawn of the new learning it was in its traditional stage. A chronological outline obtained mainly from late epitomes of earlier writers was filled in with a mass of legendary detail. The apocryphal, the legendary and the miraculous were preferred to the canonical and the historical. The writers imagined an early Church different from that of their own day in the profusion of spiritual gifts and the

display of miraculous power which were squandered upon it, but exactly like it in its ecclesiastical conditions. A wealth of story was created, abounding in poetical and ethical beauty, which has played an immense and unrealized part in building up the imaginative elements of modern life; but for an historical picture of the beginnings of Christianity there was substituted, by a method not unknown to many more pretentious schools, a reconstruction in the past of the fancies and ideals of a later age.

The new learning was early attracted by the Christian writings, but its Humanist and Platonist tendencies were stronger than its critical side. It found the writings ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite the most pleasing relics of early Christianity, and did not for a time doubt their genuineness. A more severe method was necessary to break up the past, and the needs created by the Reformation introduced the controversial period of Church history. Each school and each party had to manipulate documents in order to support its own tenets. It must prove its opponents' treatises ungenuine, and ransack the libraries to find supports for its own favourite theories. The Magdeburg Centuriators in the interests of Protestantism reduced our knowledge of the origin of Christianity to the most jejune and meagre proportions; Baronius revived for the counter-Reformation the legends of the middle-ages; but in the conflict between the two a school of theologians not confined to any one Church or country gradually evolved sounder and more critical methods. Casaubon was its founder and most striking representative; but Selden and Ussher, and Vossius and Pearson, and other well-known names, stand out prominently in the history of theological scholarship.

The publication by Baur in the year 1836 of his

treatise on the Christ party in Corinth, is a convenient date to adopt for the transition to the historical period of investigation; not that there was not historical investigation before, not that there has not been much controversial writing since; but the historical problem was then first and most clearly stated. It is gradually becoming possible to estimate the limits both of the success and failure of the Tübingen school. We say confidently that every important conclusion of the Tübingen school has been decisively disproved. But although its results have been disproved, its influence and importance are not diminished. Not merely because of the increased interest in the problems of early Church history caused by the conspicuously able exposition of new and startling doctrines, but because it stated these problems in a new way, its influence has been unique. Baur was the first writer who asked himself explicitly, not what does early Christianity prove, but what was it like? And the Church historian since his time must recognize that that is the question he is expected to answer. He must not ask what relation the early Christian books bear to the Thirty-nine Articles or the decrees of the Council of Trent or the Shorter Catechism; he must not ask a great many questions which were never in the writers' minds; but he must ask what were the problems of their day, and how did they answer them? The New Testament does not for him contain a collection of texts proving or disproving certain scholastic theses, but a body of documents moulded by the personality of their writers, bearing witness to different aspects of a common belief held in different ways by different temperaments. The crude distinction of Ebionite and Pauline Christianity is untenable, but every historian recognizes that he must investigate at least five different types of Apostolic

teaching as witnesses to the diversity and unity of the Apostolic age. He attempts to construct for us a picture of that age as it was; he does not seek to provide us with a polemical weapon. There will still be a place for the dogmatic theologian to use these documents, but his methods will be very different from those of the older teachers. He must possess a training in historical method, and use the conclusions of historical investigation.

Baur succeeded so far as the question he asked was right; he failed because his method was wrong. His object was historical; his method was not scientific. He approached the subject with *à priori* ideas, derived from the philosophy of Hegel. He developed a theory based on a one-sided study of a small number of documents, and then proceeded to rearrange the dates of the remainder in a manner which would suit his preconceived notions. The opposition to Baur has created a scientific method. The futility of opposing orthodoxy to orthodoxy, the old Christian dogmas to the new Tübingen dogmas, became clear. A method which would enable the date of documents to be fixed, on evidence which would appeal to the unbiassed investigator, was necessary. Such a method has been founded, and is being developed at the present day; and we do not think that we can be accused of insular prejudice in claiming a foremost place in that work for the English, or, more accurately, for the Cambridge school of Church history—for, although it has spread elsewhere, Cambridge is its home. The most scientific works that have been published on Church history are Lightfoot's editions of the *Apostolic Fathers*.

There is one great principle which must guide our study of the origins of Christianity. We must be able to give an adequate account of its growth. We must

work back from the known to the unknown, from the later to the earlier period; and our reconstruction of the earlier period must be such as will explain how the later rose from it. We know the Church as it was in the time of the Council of Nicaea; we can reconstruct it in broad outline as it was at the end of the second century, for from that date onwards we have full and valuable literary remains. At this early date we find a developed ecclesiastical system in existence; there is a canon of New Testament Scripture, a dogmatic position, a creed, a standard of orthodoxy, an hierarchical system. It is not fixed or definite or full-grown as in the fourth century, but it is there in unmistakeable outline. The existence of such a system must be explained. Our reconstruction of the Church at the beginning of the second century must be of a character which will account for the developement we meet with a little more than half a century later. Ecclesiastical history will not allow cataclysms any more than geology; and some recently promulgated theories seem to come perilously near to demanding such assistance. No rational method of writing history will allow us to believe that Christianity suffered a complete transformation in the second century. It developed, it grew, it expanded, as it has grown and developed and expanded since; but the germ from which it started contained the potentialities of the future expansion.

It is our purpose on these lines to attempt the reconstruction of the history of the Church at the beginning of the second century, making use of the materials which have now been vindicated by the labours of many generations of scholars as the genuine remains of the sub-Apostolic Church. These are the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, which competent critics refer almost unanimously to the years 95–97 A.D.;

and the letters of Ignatius, the genuineness of which has been conclusively proved, while even as to their date the uncertainty that prevailed for a time is passing away: tradition and evidence alike ascribe them to a period not much later than the year 110, and Professor Harnack, who at one time suggested the years 130–140, now adopts the earlier period. The Epistle of Polycarp is contemporary with those of Ignatius; the Epistle of Barnabas is not earlier than the year 80, or later than the year 120; the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles may be approximately assigned to the year 100, but perhaps contains later elements; the Shepherd of Hermas has been ascribed to the year 100, or the year 140: the former is the more probable, the latter the more common date. There are also a small number of fragments. These then, with a certain amount of apparently trustworthy tradition preserved in writers at the end of the second century, are our authorities, and for our purpose they are absolutely reliable. Their genuineness is as certain as any fact in history; their date within the limits of variation given above equally certain. We shall be treading on sure ground in making use of them to reconstruct a picture of Christianity at the close of the Apostolic period.

The end of the first century and the reign of Trajan (98–117 A.D.) form an epoch alike in the history of the Empire and of the Christian Church. Trajan was the last of the Romans, and the first of the new emperors. He was the last to extend the boundaries of the Empire; he inaugurated the period of beneficent paternal government. For the next century the peoples of the Roman world enjoyed the doubtful advantage of a secure rule afforded to them without any demand for either exertion or prudence on their part. But if the ultimate advan-

tages of an able despotism to the people who enjoy it are capable of being disputed, the importance of this period of peace to the religious history of the world was unquestionable. A great religious change such as the growth of Christianity is hardly likely to take place when men's minds are occupied with the continuous conflict of defensive wars or of constitutional struggles. The second century of the Roman Empire, by guaranteeing to the mass of the population the enjoyment of accumulated wealth or at any rate of adequate means of subsistence, by cutting them off from almost all forms of vigorous occupation and from every rational ambition, turned their minds inward and concentrated them on religious problems. It provided all the disintegrating elements which would break down old beliefs; it provided a state of society, in which the absence of struggle to occupy men's minds, the necessity of a higher hope than a life which had lost all inspiration could give, the demand for some satisfaction to ungratified spiritual needs, and the conflict of opposing creeds, aroused religious thought. And so the second century of the Christian era became one of the great periods of creative religion, more genuinely so than the fourth or fifth. The changes were made in the second century which bore their fruit in the fourth. We know that it was a period of growth in the Christian religion; unless we inspect it closely, we do not realize the immense mass of religious speculation that sprang up side by side with Christianity. The rank growth of foreign religious cults, the unnatural revival under a Stoic emperor of the old Roman religion, the worship of the head of the State, the strange phenomenon of Gnosticism, combine to create a curious picture in the history of human thought. If the Emperor Marcus Aurelius is typical of one side, the Emperor Hadrian

with his mental restlessness, his semi-sceptical speculativeness, his vague curiosity, his unformed aspirations after a future life, is typical of another. He shews that hesitating search for truth which finally led all that was best to concentrate itself in the vigorous life and healthy morality and clear rational religion of the nascent Christianity.

And to the Church, too, the close of the first century forms an epoch. A strong and trustworthy tradition tells us that the aged Apostle S. John lingered on at Ephesus to the times of Trajan, and that just at the close of the first century of the Christian era he died. Of the historical importance of his life we shall have to speak later; from the time of his death the Church is left no longer possessing the inspiration or guidance of the first generation of its teachers, with no living voice to tell it of its Founder, for the battle and the struggle of the coming times. It is just at this point we take up our story. We wish to know what Christianity was at the moment when the last of the Apostles died, at the moment when it started on its contest and struggle with the varied forms of Eastern superstition which contended for the possession of the Roman world.

Our first view of it will be from the side of cultivated Roman society. There are few more charming collections of letters than those of the younger Pliny, and there have been few more charming societies than that to which they introduce us. It is a society of cultivated gentlemen that adorned the reign of Trajan. They are the officials and the lawyers and the literary men who formed the higher part of the Roman aristocracy of the day and provided a portion of the material by means of which that splendid administrative machine, the Roman Empire of the second century, was carried on. They are none of them great men, but they are all

capable and efficient men of business; only one is a great writer, but all have attained a high level of culture. We are interested with the consciousness they have of their duties as country gentlemen, in the management of their estates, in the building of a temple, in the erection of a statue, in the foundation of a local charity. They are somewhat rationalistic, but they are not without a pleasing touch of superstition and credulity; they take an interest in scenery and in natural phenomena; they are considerate and thoughtful to their slaves and dependants. Altogether it is a pleasing society. To this literary set belonged the three writers —the younger Pliny himself, the historians Tacitus and Suetonius—from whom we have the earliest non-Christian accounts of Christianity, and we naturally turn to them with interest to find out what they have to say.

Tacitus had investigated the subject with some industry, and had a not incorrect idea of the origin of Christianity. Of its character he had no doubt. Christians were unpopular for their crimes; their religion was a "detestable superstition"; it comes to Rome because to that city everything that is foul and shameful finds its way. Suetonius is very short: he is content with describing it as "a new and baneful superstition." The younger Pliny is brought in contact with it in his province of Bithynia. Although in his experience as a lawyer he had never come across cases in which Christians had appeared—this was because his practice had been entirely in what we call commercial cases—he evidently had heard the worst rumours concerning them. Yet he has the honesty to confess that on investigation these rumours are not corroborated. But although the worst charges are disproved, he is convinced that it is a depraved and immodest supersti-

tion ; and although its members have committed no offence, yet death is a very suitable punishment for their incurable obstinacy. This was the aspect that Christianity presented to the most humane members of Roman society.

But the letter in which Pliny describes to the Emperor his dealings with the new sect, and the Emperor's reply, are above all valuable as giving a quite unbiassed account of Christian persecution. The common opinion until recently among German critics has been to ascribe the initiation of Christian persecutions to Trajan, whose letter to Pliny, or Rescript, as it is technically called, was, they asserted, the first positive ordinance against the Christians. Dr. Lightfoot pointed out that such a view was untenable, and his opinion has been supported and confirmed by Professor Mommsen in Germany and by Sir William Ramsay in England. We may now take it as proved that the letter of Pliny written early in the second century implies the existence of trials of Christians as a recognized and not uncommon institution, and that the Rescript of Trajan implies the modification of the more severe regulations of his predecessors. Much is and must remain uncertain ; but this perhaps may be considered as established. The persecution of the Christians by the Empire began with the crime of Nero, and that act of the Emperor was sufficient to make Christianity illegal. Whether or no there were edicts issued against the Christians generally shortly after the massacres in Rome, as one late writer, perhaps following the lost books of Tacitus, states, we cannot say. At any rate, the very fact that in Rome, before the Emperor or his representative, Christians as such had been condemned, was sufficient to make the accusation a valid one throughout the Empire, and the provincial governors could proceed against Christians as

public enemies and guilty of sacrilege, by virtue of the *imperium* inherent in their office. Further than this, it early became part of the traditional policy of Rome that the Christians were dangerous to the State, and that Christianity must be suppressed. The future Emperor Titus is represented to us as discussing, after the fall of Jerusalem, what fate should be reserved for that city. The traditional policy of Rome would counsel leniency, but there were reasons in this case on the other side. Jerusalem was the source from which two great evils under which the Empire suffered had flowed —Judaism and Christianity. They were distinct, even antagonistic; but they had the same origin, and when the home of their birth was destroyed, both, it was calculated, would perish. So the Jewish capital was destroyed and the war against Christianity continued. The Christians are public enemies; their religion is illegal and prohibited; they have no rights before the law; they are always exposed to the most severe repressive measures; they are always liable to imprisonment and death. No government is ever consistent and continuous in persecution; the exact position of a Christian at any moment might vary infinitely according to the personal character of the Emperor, the policy of the provincial governor, the public opinion of the province. The decline of trade or a public calamity, love of popularity or zeal for religion, all might produce persecution. It was not continuous, it was always imminent; no Christian could be certain that he might not find himself called upon at any moment to lay down his life for the creed that he professed.

How severe persecution might be, how much greater it was than has sometimes been supposed, the letter of Pliny is sufficient evidence. It is the accidental record of an outbreak in Bithynia or Pontus. The cause of

this seems to have been the injury done to trade by the decay of Paganism: there was no market for sacrificial victims. The governor is a humane man, who narrates the circumstances with fairness but without feeling. It is clear that the number who perished of both sexes and every age was very large. "The matter seemed to me worth deliberation, especially on account of the number of those in danger; for many of all ages and every rank, and even of both sexes, are brought into present or future danger." It is often said that the early Christians exaggerated the accounts of the persecutions, that they have told us everything that happened and much more, that they "concealed nothing and recorded everything." This instance shews how untrue such a statement is. Here is a provincial persecution of much magnitude, yet we have no information about it except from heathen sources. The accidental preservation of the letters of a Roman governor who was a literary man warns us that much happened of which we have no record, and has enabled us to realize the early date and terrible character of the laws under which Christianity grew up. But a careful and unbiassed study of early Christian literature would be sufficient to prove this. Behind it all there is a background of persecution.

The First Epistle of S. Peter, the Apocalypse, the Epistle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the letters of Ignatius, the martyrdom of Polycarp—we have enumerated the greater number of early Christian documents—all alike testify to an atmosphere of persecution. The writer of the Apocalypse is a provincial, an inhabitant of the province of Asia: "Rome is on the extreme horizon, and is conceived only as the distant metropolis where the martyrs are sent to suffer the death decreed against them." She is "Babylon the great, the

Woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." The persecutor is represented as a great beast whom "all that dwell in the earth shall worship, save only those that are written in the Book of Life." He has authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation. He speaks blasphemies against God and His Name. He makes war upon the saints. All who do not worship his image shall be killed. All alike, rich and poor, must wear the mark of the beast. Some of the saints have fallen, but some have overcome; they have preserved the seal of the Lamb upon their foreheads: "And they have come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." No book can shew deeper signs of a widespread persecution. The Apocalypse was written not in Rome, but in Asia; and it shews how Christianity grew up under the continuous danger of a persecution which at times became terrible and almost overwhelming.

The best illustration of the history of the Church from within will be found by following the developement of the three Churches of which we have most information at this early period.

The Church of Rome, as we meet it first, is a collection of small bodies of Christians who have sprung up round individual and unofficial teachers. The Jews and the floating commercial population, among whom Christianity had first spread, were a nomadic population. Many disciples of S. Paul had, in the course of their business, or for other reasons, found their way to Rome—the drain towards which all the scum of the earth floated, Tacitus would have said; and around them had grown up small communities, such as those referred to at the end of the Epistle to the Romans.

Archaeology gives strong evidence for thinking that a large number of those addressed at the end of that Epistle were slaves, probably slaves of the Imperial household. Certainly such a strange mixture of names could have been found nowhere else than in the Roman slave world. Some of them had been formerly slaves of the fallen freedman Narcissus, whose property at his death would be forfeited to the Emperor; some of them had been members of the household of Aristobulus, a scion of the Herodian family who had spent his days in Rome and left his estate to Claudius. When S. Paul came to Rome in the year 60, these small, isolated and servile communities grew with incredible rapidity, and by the year 64 Tacitus is able to speak of the "immense multitude" of Christians. Rome, while S. Paul was there, became the centre of Gentile Christianity. Delegates from the different Gentile Churches would come and go; letters were despatched and received. With S. Paul came that band of companions which followed him in all his journeys. Timothy, Silas, Mark, and many others would add to the teaching of Christianity. But not only S. Paul: S. Peter also came. Into the exact chronology of the visits of the two great teachers, into the many questions which are continually being discussed and always re-opened, it is not our purpose to enter. It is sufficient to say here that in our opinion (and we follow the view of Dr. Lightfoot) the evidence that S. Peter as well as S. Paul taught at Rome is strong and clear. Neither of them was in the most accurate sense the founder of the Church, for a body of Christians had grown up before either of them arrived; but it probably owed its organization and existence as a strong and powerful body to their united labours, and the tradition of the early Church which headed the list of Roman

bishops with Paul and Peter represents a true historical fact.

But a terrible fate was to overtake the Roman Church. The combined evidence of heathen and Christian writers makes the persecution of Nero one of the most real tragedies of history. We can read in the pages of his letter how it impressed Clement, the Roman bishop, himself an early convert to Christianity, and probably a spectator of the scenes he describes; and we may be allowed to sum up its character in the words of Dr. Lightfoot:

"The suspenses and anxieties of that terrible season when the informer was abroad and every Christian carried his life in his hand must have stamped themselves vividly on his memory. The refined cruelty of the tortures—the impalements and the pitchy tunics, the living torches making night hideous with the lurid flames and piercing cries, the human victims clad in the skins of wild beasts and hunted in the arena, while the populace gloated over these revels and the Emperor indulged his mad orgies—these were scenes which no lapse of time could efface. Above all—the climax of horrors—were the outrages, far worse than death itself, inflicted on weak women and innocent girls."

Thirty years afterwards, when Clement wrote his letter to the Corinthians, it is these scenes which have impressed themselves vividly on his memory and which he takes as typical examples of what envy could do.

It is towards the end of this century that we again become acquainted with the Roman Church. A secular historian has told us how in the later years of Domitian's life, when his tyranny became excessive, he executed certain members of the Roman nobility on the charge of atheism and Jewish rites. Christian historians have claimed them as Christians, and it has been the custom

to speak of this as the second Christian persecution. On this subject there had been a long and vigorous controversy, but the archaeological discoveries of De Rossi in Rome afford strong evidence that Christianity was the charge on which they perished. Amongst the names mentioned is a certain M'. Acilius Glabrio, who was Consul in the year 90. In making investigations into the catacomb of S. Priscilla, De Rossi came on a large sepulchral chamber which was the starting-point of the catacomb, and this he discovered to be the burial-place of the Acilii Glabriones. Their social and political position gave them the right of possessing a family burying-place: round this grew up a burying-place of poorer Christians who became dependents on the house, and from their tombs started a Christian catacomb.

But two other names are of even greater interest. The Consul of the year 95, as colleague of Domitian himself, was Titus Flavius Clemens. He was the Emperor's first cousin, and his wife was Domitilla, the Emperor's niece. Their high position did not save them. Domitian seems to have been intensely jealous of his relations. They were accused of atheism and Jewish rites. The husband was executed: the wife was banished to an island. Again Christianity has claimed them, and again archaeology has justified the claim. Just as the starting-point of the catacomb of S. Priscilla was the burying-place of the Acilii Glabriones, so the starting-point of the catacombs of S. Domitilla was the burying-place of Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Flavius Clemens. Again we find a Christian community clustering round a great Roman family. But the interest of the discovery is not completed. The father of Flavius Clemens was Titus Flavius Sabinus, the brother of the Emperor Vespasian, who had been city

prefect during the persecution of Nero. He was a man of gentle character, deficient it was said in energy, but distinguished for his moderation, for his hatred of bloodshed, for his hesitation to sacrifice the lives of his fellow-citizens. Yet his official position had made him the agent, if the unwilling agent, of the Emperor in that persecution. It is legitimate for the historian to speculate on the effects of those scenes on his character and life. One fact is not a matter of speculation. The son of the chief agent in the Neronian persecution himself died on the charge of complicity with Christianity.

But again we ask, how had Christianity reached this family? We possess what a lengthy series of able criticisms seems to shew is a correct and authentic list of the Roman Bishops. The work of Lipsius and Duchesne, corrected and completed by Dr. Lightfoot in the most masterly of all his critical essays, has found a way through the tangled skein of later corruptions, and given us an early and trustworthy historical document. Third in this list is the name of Clemens, and historians have often attempted to realize the connexion between the Roman Bishop and the Roman Consul, who were contemporaries, bore the same name, and were both Christians. Some have identified them; but this is impossible. It is more probable that Clement, the Roman Bishop, was a freedman or client of the Flavian house and the family of Clement. Himself brought up perhaps as a Jew, and speaking Greek, he had learnt the religion of Christ from the Apostles themselves. In process of time the strength and moderation of his character raised him to the position of head of the Roman Church, and his relations to the Flavian family made him the means by which Christianity entered a family on the threshold of the Imperial throne.

His name is commemorated by one of the oldest

Roman churches, but we possess a memorial of him which to us is far more important. A consensus of early writers ascribes to him a letter written (as internal evidence clearly shews) about the end of the first century by the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, and this tradition is almost unanimously accepted. A dissension had arisen in the Corinthian Church—the old spirit of faction, such as we know it from S. Paul's Epistles. "They had risen up against the duly commissioned rulers of their Church—presbyters who had been appointed by the Apostles themselves, or by those immediately so appointed—and had ejected them from office." It is with this situation that the Epistle deals, and, as the situation demands, it is a great panegyric of order. Order and harmony are exhibited in the universe, order was the characteristic of the work of our Saviour; order of the army and the State, of the human body, of the Christian Society, of the Jewish services; order was the aim of the arrangements made by the Apostles for the government of the Church; to order Clement recalls the Corinthian Church, and then he closes his letter with a great liturgical prayer to Him who is the primal Source of all creation and sovereignty and peace.

Clement is a true representative of the spirit of Rome. He is Roman in all ways. He is Roman in his sense of order. He is Roman in his comprehensiveness; he combines all the great types of Apostolic doctrine. He is equally indebted to the teaching of S. Paul and S. James. The early Church was a body full of life and vigour, and there were many questions which different teachers approached from different sides. There had been controversies about faith and works, and these two Apostles had taken different, if not actually opposing, views. Clement, however illogically, combines

their teaching. "Wherefore was our father Abraham blessed?" he asks. "Was it not because he wrought righteousness and truth by faith?" In one place he writes: "We are not justified by ourselves, nor by works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but by our faith"; but immediately he adds the main contention of S. James: "Let us work the work of righteousness with all our strength." A careful historical study of the New Testament shews us that the books contained in it represent five main types of Apostolic teaching. Of these the writings of S. John had probably at this time hardly passed beyond the small circle of his immediate disciples. The remaining four, S. Paul and S. James, S. Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews, were all well known to Clement, and quoted by him. His theology is built up on Apostolic writings, which clearly belong, even then, to a past generation.

Clement is Roman also in his moderation. He is zealous but not fanatical. All his zeal is controlled by his practical sense, by his love of order, by his power of self-restraint. He had all the power which an intense moderation (to use his own phrase) can give. His reasonableness was inspired by his glowing ardour. His ardour is controlled by a strong reason. And so Clement is rightly typical of all that has been highest and best in Rome and the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome attained its spiritual eminence because it represented order in the midst of chaos, comprehensiveness as opposed to sectarianism, self-restraint as opposed to extravagance, unity as opposed to dissension. The capacity of ruling is latent in the history of Clement, and it was inherited by the Church of Rome from the Roman Empire.

From Rome we pass to Antioch. And we shall find

a great change in the atmosphere with which we are surrounded. We shall pass from the stateliness and dignity and moderation of a writer who (although himself a Jew) has caught much of the dignified spirit of Pagan Rome, and suggests the lines on which Christian Rome developed, to one who interprets Christianity with all the fervour of Oriental enthusiasm. The Christianity is the same; the language is the same, for both Clement the Roman and Ignatius the Syrian speak the universal Greek. But in the disposition and character of the writers the difference is immense.

Antioch was the third city of the Empire, the head of the great province of Syria. Situated a few miles from the mouth of the river Orontes, it was the great emporium of the trade of the East. A Greek city founded by the Seleucid successors of Alexander, it was famous for the beauty of its situation, the magnificence of its buildings, the luxury, the turbulence, the fickleness, the dissoluteness of its inhabitants. It was an outpost of Greek civilization, but a Greek civilization which had been demoralized by contact with Orientalism. Writers have vied with one another in rhetorical descriptions of the groves of Daphne, where the greatest beauty of nature and of art, groves of sweet-scented trees, rippling streams, colonnades and porticoes adorned with beautiful statues, were consecrated to the services of an immorality sanctified by religion. Juvenal has told us how the Orontes had flowed into the Tiber, and it was the most impressive way of describing the degradation brought to Rome by its Eastern population. The ministers to every form of degraded luxury, the panders to every base art, quacks and magicians and soothsayers, the devotees of all the lowest forms of Eastern religion, had found their way from Antioch to Rome. For its wealth, its violence, its turbulence,

and its degradation, Antioch was unsurpassed in the Oriental world.

It had played an important part in the history of Christianity. It had been the home and centre of the Gentile Church. Here the fugitives from the earliest persecutions preached to the Greeks; here came Saul and Barnabas; here the disciples were first called Christians—that is, received from the Gentile population a name marking them out as distinct from the Jews. Hence Barnabas and Saul went forth on their first missionary journey; here first disputes arose as to the obligation of the law on the Gentile converts; here took place the great discussion between S. Paul and S. Peter:—the history of Antioch in Apostolic times closes with a bold vindication of Christian liberty.

By the end of the second century there existed a list of Bishops of Antioch—a list the historical character of which there is no reason to doubt. First in it comes Evodius, second Ignatius, of whose life, or rather of the end of whose life, one strange episode is known. He had been condemned as a Christian to perish by the wild beasts in Rome, and we meet him being led through Asia by a small company of soldiers—bound to ten leopards, he describes it. He arrives at Smyrna, and is hospitably entertained there by the Church and its Bishop Polycarp. Thither came to meet him delegates from the neighbouring Churches with their bishops at their head. From Ephesus, from Magnesia, from Tralles (invited by messengers who warned them of his approach), they came to greet the martyr Bishop. At Smyrna Ignatius wrote four letters—to the Churches of Tralles, Magnesia and Ephesus by the hands of their bishops, and to the Church of Rome. From Smyrna he went to Troas, and thence wrote letters to Philadelphia, to Smyrna, and to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. We can

trace his journey as far as Philippi, and then he vanishes from our knowledge. All subsequent ages have honoured him as the typical martyr of Church history, and to that title his letter to the Romans well qualifies him; but of his martyrdom itself no authentic history has come down to us. Just one episode in these last days we know, and no more. He flashes across the page of history and is lost again.

Ignatius, as is well known, appears in his letters as the champion of orthodoxy and episcopacy. The Churches of Asia were troubled, and had been since the Apostles' days troubled, by a form of false teaching which to our modern ideas is singularly strange. Technically it is known as "Judaistic Docetism." It denied the reality of Christ's human life and human sufferings. There is something significant in the fact that this should have been the earliest form of false teaching to which Christianity was exposed. Influenced, however unconsciously, by Oriental dualism, men found the thought of a union between God and man almost inconceivable. Their half-Manichean ideas of suffering and evil would not allow them to believe that the Divine had been contaminated with suffering. The Church teaching that Jesus was Divine was too strong to be denied and too attractive to be given up. They could believe that God had dwelt among men; they could not believe that He became man; and they denied the Incarnation by denying the humanity. It is not until the middle of the second century that there is any record of a purely humanitarian teaching on the person of Christ. To deny His Divinity was an afterthought; to deny His humanity was an early form of error. Against such teaching the writings of Ignatius are an almost continuous protest. Its adherents he attacks in the severest language. Indirectly he con-

demns it by a strong assertion of the reality of Christ's humanity, of the reality of His sufferings, of the reality and union of the two natures. The intense personal bearing of this religion may be shewn by a short extract:

"If these things were done by our Lord in semblance, then am I also a prisoner in semblance. And why then have I delivered myself over to death, unto fire, unto sword, unto wild beasts? But near to the sword, near to God; in company with wild beasts, in company with God. Only let it be the Name of Jesus Christ, so that we may suffer together with Him. I endure all things, seeing that He Himself enableth me, who is perfect Man."

Again and again he lays stress on the reality of all the historical appearances of Christ. The Divine, the historical, the suffering Christ, is the centre of all his teaching. Christ is the end of his worship, his hope and his life.

And it is for this reason that he is the champion of Episcopacy. The Bishop is to him the guarantee of unity and harmony and purity of doctrine. He does not care for episcopacy for its own sake, yet his language will seem surprising to many modern readers.

"Let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of Apostles. Apart from these there is not the name of a church. . . . He that is within the sanctuary is clean; but he that is without the sanctuary is not clean,—that is, he that doeth aught without the bishop and presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience. . . . But these divisions are the beginnings of evil. Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the Apostles; and to the deacons pay respect as to God's commandment. Let no man do aught of things

pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop. Let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. Whereso-ever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful, apart from the bishop, either to baptize or to hold a love feast: but whatsoever he shall approve that is well-pleasing also to God, that everything which ye do may be sure and valid."

It is not necessary to quote more. Episcopacy in the opinion of Ignatius is part of the necessary and natural constitution of the Church. It is not a new institution, it is of Apostolic origin; it is not local, he looks upon it as universal; it was necessary for valid sacraments, as a pledge of order and authority; the bishop was a necessary condition of a true Church, and a pledge of true religious teaching.

Six of the letters of Ignatius are controversial. The seventh, that to the Romans, stands apart as unique in Christian or any literature. It is singular for its bold Oriental metaphors, for its unrestrained exuberance of style and feeling, for its intense depths of religious earnestness, for its strange fervent eagerness for martyr-dom. It begins by enumerating the excellences and glories of the Roman Church: "the Church that is beloved and enlightened; her that hath the presidency in the country of the region of the Romans; worthy of God, worthy of felicitation, worthy of praise, worthy of success, worthy of purity, having the presidency of love." The cause of his writing is his fear that the Roman Church may use its influence to save him from martyrdom.

"I dread your very love lest it do me an injury. Of my own free will I die for God. . . . Let me be given to the wild beasts, for through them I can attain unto God."

He describes his death in a metaphor which is very strange, but is often quoted:

"I am God's wheat, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread. . . . Now I am beginning to be a disciple. May naught of things visible and things invisible envy me; so that I may attain unto Jesus Christ. Come fire and cross and grapplings with wild beasts, wrenching of bones, hacking of limbs, crushings of my whole body, come cruel tortures of the devil to assail me. Only be it mine to attain unto Jesus Christ. . . . The pangs of a new birth are upon me. . . . Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God. . . . My lust hath been crucified, and there is no fire of material longing in me, but only water, . . . saying within me, Come to the Father. I have no delight in the food of corruption or in the delights of this life. I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Christ, who was of the seed of David; and for a draught I desire His blood, which is love incorruptible."

The metaphors may be unrestrained, the language exaggerated—the extracts we have selected shew that well—but there is no sign of unreality. We cannot fail to feel the sincerity and the depth of the enthusiasm revealed. If we compare these writings with the self-restraint of Clement, we are astonished at the contrast; but yet the beliefs of the two are the same. It is when we realize the force and power of the Gospel in such different characters and dispositions that we learn the cause of its universal and rapid spread. The world can shew few things more striking than this glowing untempered zeal for martyrdom which overpowers all earthly longings.

The life of Ignatius has already taken us to Asia, but the history of Christianity in that province demands a

more detailed study. The word Asia is, it must be remembered, invariably used at this period to mean the Roman province of that name. It included the upland plains of Phrygia, famous in mythology as the home of the wild orgies of the goddess whom the Greeks called Cybele, conspicuous in Christian history as the home of Montanism. It included Mysia, Lydia and Caria, the sea-coasts of Ionia, and the islands of the Aegean. It was a land of great and ancient cities: chief among them was Ephesus; but Smyrna, Miletus, Pergamum, Sardis, and the cities of the Maeander and Lycus valleys, Tralles, Laodicea, Colossae, Hierapolis, besides many more, have won a name both in secular and in Christian history.

The real establishment of Christianity in this district dates from S. Paul's lengthy sojourn in Ephesus, when "all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks." It is needless to repeat all the events in this early period. The burning of the books of the magicians is a striking illustration of the character of the popular religion of the day; the outbreak in the theatre is typical of many a later persecution of the Christians. We must pass over the final farewell of S. Paul to the elders of the Church at Miletus, the Epistles of the captivity—those to the Colossians and Philemon, and that circular letter, a copy of which we possess, addressed to the Ephesians—the letters addressed to Timothy, although from all alike we might learn under Dr. Lightfoot's guidance much which the ordinary reader fails to see. About the year 63 the troubles which culminated in the fall of Jerusalem broke out, and had a marked effect on the Christian history of the province of Asia. The Church of Jerusalem was dispersed, and one if not several members of the Apostolic body settled in Asia in their old age. That S. John

did so we have ample evidence; that S. Andrew did so there is some, although less, proof. It is more certainly true of a Philip, who was generally called the Apostle, but probably was the Evangelist. S. John settled at Ephesus, where his grave was shewn in the second century; Philip at Hierapolis, where his daughters were famous as prophetesses. During the last thirty years of the first century, the most obscure period in Christian history, Asia, more especially Ephesus, was the centre of Christian tradition. Here, on the shores of the Aegean, were heard the last echoes of the Gospel message; here lived and died the last of those who had seen the Lord; here the last record of the memories of the Sea of Galilee was written down, and for a time there lingered on traditions of the life and teaching of the Founder of Christianity.

Round the figure of S. John in his old age there gather a number of stories testifying to the many-sided character of one who combined the attributes of the Son of Thunder and the Apostle of Love. But two sets of traditions are of far greater importance than the rest—those that identify him with the author of the Gospel and Epistles that bear his name, and those that ascribe to him the organization of the Christian Churches of Asia. The Gospel and First Epistle of S. John are undoubtedly the production of the same author, and there is an early and consistent tradition ascribing them to S. John and to his residence at Ephesus. A careful examination of the works themselves will reveal the fact that the author had clearly in view opinions which he held to be erroneous on the person of Christ, and these he combats in the Epistle directly, in the Gospel implicitly. "Any spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and any spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God." The teaching

thus combated was a Docetic view of the person of Christ, a denial of the reality of His humanity. Now we have already found in the Epistles of Ignatius evidence of the existence in these regions of Judaic Docetism, and such teaching we find referred to in almost every document which comes from Asia. It is suggested in S. Paul's speech to the elders at Miletus, it is implied in the Epistle to the Colossians, it is attacked in the Pastoral Epistles. But more than this, we are definitely told, and the tradition is strong and independent, that there was a contemporary of S. John of the name of Cerinthus, whose teaching is described as being of this Judaistic and Docetic character. These various traditions and independent chains of evidence corroborate one another. All alike imply the existence of a similar type of teaching in the province of Asia. They enable us to construct a definite picture of the ecclesiastical controversies there at the close of the first century. The Gospel and Epistle could only have been written amid certain surroundings, and these are exactly supplied by the condition of the Church of Ephesus at the end of the first century and at no other time.

A chain of good evidence also connects S. John with the organization of the Churches of the province of Asia. Irenaeus, the pupil of Polycarp, tells us that Polycarp was "appointed by Apostles bishop of the Church in Smyrna." And elsewhere, that "the Church of Ephesus, where John survived to the time of Trajan, is a trustworthy witness of the Apostolic tradition." Clement of Alexandria represents the Apostle, during his later years when he resided at Ephesus, as going about "appointing bishops in some places, establishing whole Churches in others, ordaining clergy in others." Other writers corroborate this testimony. Again we shall find our tradition independently confirmed. A

few years later Ignatius visits these Churches and finds them all organized, with the three primitive orders of bishops, priests and deacons existing as an established and integral part of the Church. Such a position implies that they were not a new body, but had existed some considerable time—at least from the days of the Apostle John. The traditions, which are independent of these letters, find themselves corroborated by them.

Round the Apostle there was collected a body of disciples who carried on to another generation the memories that he had preserved. There was one Aristion, who is probably to be identified with the writer of that summary account of the Resurrection which we call the last twelve verses of S. Mark; there was, perhaps, the Presbyter John, a somewhat hazy if not mythical figure, who has played a greater part in modern controversy than he did in real life; there was Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, who wrote an exposition of the Lord's oracles, some few fragments of which, preserved by Eusebius, have been the parent of a weighty progeny of Teutonic literature; there was, above all, Polycarp, whose life we have now to follow.

He was born about the year 70, a date we can fix with considerable accuracy, for he was martyred about the year 155, and in the account of his martyrdom he is represented as saying, "Fourscore and six years have I been His servant, and He hath done me no wrong. How, then, can I blaspheme my King, who saved me?" There are four epochs in his life. We meet him first as a young man, the companion and disciple of the aged Apostle, and by him appointed Bishop of the Church in Smyrna. "Long years afterwards it was his delight in old age to relate to his younger friends what he had heard from eye-witnesses of the Lord's earthly life, and more especially to dwell on his intercourse with the

Apostle S. John." A few years after the death of the Apostle the martyr Ignatius passes through Asia on his way to Rome; he halts at Smyrna, where he receives assiduous attention from Polycarp. In almost all his letters he speaks affectionately of him. From Troas he writes to Polycarp himself:

"The season requires thee as pilots require wind, and as a storm-tossed mariner a haven, that it may attain unto God. Be sober as God's athlete; it is the part of a great athlete to receive blows and to conquer."

Meanwhile Ignatius had charged Polycarp to write to the Churches lying eastward, and to entreat them to send letters and delegates to Antioch. He had given the same advice to the Philippians, and they had written to Polycarp asking him to forward their letter. He replied, and his letter is preserved to us: he congratulates the Philippians on their attention to Ignatius; he sends them copies of all the letters of Ignatius that he possesses, and he asks them to communicate to him any letters they may possess. So grew up our present collection of the Ignatian letters.

The province of Asia continued to be a centre of Christian life, and we find Polycarp in his old age the teacher of a younger band of disciples. One of them, Irenaeus, afterwards Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, the great ecclesiastical writer of the end of the second century, has left us his reminiscences of these days:

"I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than the events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received from childhood growing with the growth of the soul became identified with it; so that I can tell the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and

how he would describe his intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord and about His miracles and about His teaching Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures."

"The place," says M. Renan, "was without doubt one of the terraces on the slope of Mount Pagus, whence we descry the sparkling bay and its beautiful girdle of mountains. . . . An echo of Galilee thus made itself heard, at a distance of a hundred and twenty years, on the shores of another sea."

One last incident in his life connects Polycarp with the See of Rome. The great controversies had begun between the Roman and Asiatic Churches on the date of keeping Easter, controversies which at a later date almost created a schism. Polycarp visited Rome in 154, then a very old man, apparently to discuss this question. No agreement was arrived at, but it is specially recorded that, as a sign that differences of opinion on such a point should not be allowed to break the harmony that prevailed, Polycarp celebrated the Eucharist in the Roman Church; and this incident was quoted in a later age when differences had become more acute as a sign of the peace and harmony of an earlier time. It was not long after this that the end came. A letter, written by the Church of Smyrna very shortly after the event, is still preserved, giving us an account of Polycarp's martyrdom. The writer finds or fancies analogies to the death of the Lord, he finds miracles in events which might well be natural; but he has written an account without exaggeration or affectation, the historical character of which no one could doubt. Polycarp

died adhering firmly to the faith in which he had lived, and it was related how that day his disciple, Irenaeus, then in Rome, seemed to hear a voice saying to him, Polycarp has been martyred.

The individuality of Polycarp is as marked as that of either Ignatius or Clement, but differs strongly from both. His letter reflects it well. It is singularly unoriginal, singularly unimaginative, a mere cento of quotations; but it exactly corresponds to the character of the writer. He was above all the stubborn, strenuous adherent of the tradition and the teaching of his youth. He kept an unrelaxing, unwearying hold of the word that was delivered to him from the beginning. Amid the changes and variations of the times, amid the plausibilities of false teachers, he stood "firm as an anvil beneath the hammer's stroke,"—so Ignatius had written; and his character and life are facts of supreme importance in estimating the continuity of Christian teaching. The Apostle John lived to a great age and died about the year 100; his pupil, Polycarp, lived beyond the middle of the next century; the pupil of Polycarp was Irenaeus. Irenaeus has left us a work which sums up all the main points of Christian custom and teaching in his own day. To ascribe everything that he teaches to his instructors would be absurd: events had moved rapidly; thought was vigorous; new situations had arisen, and new ideas were in the air. But it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the outlines of the traditions which Irenaeus taught had come from the Apostle John, and represented the teaching and ideas of early Christianity. Christianity grew and developed, but there was no cataclysm or break of continuity in its history; it developed on the lines which its first teachers had laid down. One solid basis of fact that assures us of this is the life of Polycarp the Elder.

The developement of the Church was conditioned by the fact that Christianity was an unlicensed religion; its earlier years therefore were passed in a state of semi-obscurity. Its meetings would be only in private houses, and any open or obvious organization was impossible. In one direction, however, the Church would early be brought in contact with the State. Some place and method were necessary to enable it to bury its dead. Many of its members were of the lowest orders, whose bodies would naturally be consigned to the slave pits, but who now regarded their earthly remains as objects of reverential care. How could the Church acquire and hold land for the purpose? The difficulty seems to have been evaded at Rome by the system which developed into the Catacombs. Members of the wealthier classes who were Christians, appear to have allowed burial-places for the poorer classes in the community to be excavated in the plot of ground they had secured for themselves and their family, and this formed the starting-point of the huge underground cemeteries. In Asia archaeology has recorded to us another method. Sir William Ramsay has discovered a large number of tombs, evidently Christian in character, in which the community is mentioned under some enigmatical name. Although private societies, or "collegia" as they were called, which had or might conceal a political aim were vigorously suppressed, similar bodies with a religious object or for the purposes of burial were allowed to exist. The former object was impossible in the case of the Christian, for his religion was unauthorized; the latter was open to him. The assumed name was probably a somewhat transparent disguise which satisfied an easy official conscience. In any case we find the Christians of the interior portions of Asia Minor known officially by such names as "the Brethren," "the neigh-

bourhood of the First-Gate people," "the Neotheroi," "those who are bathed in purple."

We should find one of these communities, if we were to examine it, a small well-organized body with a strong sense of its own unity, bound together by the ties of a common religion and life, by the possession of a deep inexpressible knowledge, by the consciousness that its members were the elect and chosen of the one only God. Their act of initiation had been Baptism—a rite which impressed itself on the imagination with deep spiritual significance far greater than we can realize. Baptism had implied the acceptance of a simple but clear profession of faith, of a high standard of personal life, and a willingness to submit to the discipline and order vested in the community. This local Church was governed by a body of officers whose authority rested on direct commission from the original founders of the Church. They had been appointed by the Apostles, or by those who had themselves been thus appointed, and they as a body were the depositaries of the traditions of teaching then received, of the books then or since delivered to them, of the baptismal creed which formulated that teaching. They consisted of a body of presbyters or elders, one of whom, the Bishop, was president of the community, and exercised in his own person or by delegation all its spiritual functions. The supremacy of the Bishop is more marked in an early document like the letters of Ignatius than at a later time, when his functions were constantly delegated to presbyters at different Churches. The duties of the presbyters were mainly those of instruction and government; they were the body who with their president, the Bishop, directed and regulated the affairs of the Church. The deacons were the attendants on the Bishop: they assisted him in his spiritual functions, they distributed

the bread and wine at the Eucharist, they were employed in the distribution of alms. Already in the time of Hermas we hear of one who was guilty of fraud in this capacity. The position of women in the East made a further order of deaconesses necessary.

If on one side the Church was a body with spiritual aims, on another it was what we should call a "benefit" society. This characteristic was typified by the common meal or "love feast," when the poor feasted at the expense of the rich. Originally connected with the rites of Christian worship, it was separated probably early in the second century; the Eucharist being transferred to the morning, the common meal remaining in the evening, and the change being made at a time when the existence of the common meal might have led to the Christian community being looked upon as an unauthorized college. This idea of a benefit club was kept up by the distribution of alms collected at the regular Church assemblies. They were bestowed on the widows and orphans, on those in prison for the faith, on the entertainment of strangers and travellers. A regular list was kept of all members of the community. It contained the names of the Bishop and other officers; of the widows, orphans, and all those who received alms; of the ordinary members of the community. All alike were subject to very severe discipline—a discipline which could be exercised with great force, for in the minds, at any rate, of most of its members, exclusion from the visible society meant exclusion from the heavenly rewards. Moral failure, denial of the faith in persecution, unauthorized teaching, might all alike lead to excommunication. Public confession and admonition —probably, in some undeveloped form, a penitential system—already existed.

But the Christian bodies were not isolated com-

munities. Both in theory and practice they were members of a great organization which stretched over the whole civilized world, an intangible network hidden under the surface. They were bound together in theory. The doctrine of the Church, an expansion of the Jewish belief of a chosen people, was one of the earliest ideas which obtained a strong hold on the popular mind. How strong may be seen by the effect it had on the mind of the slave Hermas—a half-educated member of the Roman community—who through a long series of visions is always coming back to the idea of a Church. Now it is the aged woman, who can become younger and fairer in face; now it is the tower built on a rock which is the Son of God, with stones collected from all the nations upon earth. The Christian communities were bound together by the consciousness that they were members of a larger community. They were bound together in practice also. The organization which grew up not much later than this, consisting of councils of bishops of the same or neighbouring provinces, did not probably as yet exist; but a practical unity and harmony were kept up by the letters sent from Church to Church, by occasional meetings of bishops, by visits of delegates and travellers such as the life of Ignatius suggests, by the assistance sent from richer to poorer Churches, by the custom of commendatory letters. Amongst the most important of the practical virtues in the early Church was that of hospitality, a fact which enables us to realize the character of the early Christian communities. It had that peculiar strength which Judaism has so often had in the world's history—that of a strong, self-contained, detached organization existing within a larger one. It had what Judaism did not have, the seeds of expansion and growth. There was nothing complex in its organization. Every community

was able to exist by itself, but yet it was closely bound with every other. All Christians were united by common beliefs and aims. They were all baptized into one Church and one Name. They had one faith and one hope. And to whatever city a Christian might go, he would, if he had full credentials, find a home and hospitality and friends. It was just that type of organization—and it existed as such from the very beginning—that a well-governed empire would dread.

The unity of the community was obtained by the unity of its services. The central act of worship seems from the beginning to have been the Eucharist. The unity of the different communities was maintained by the fact that every Christian with proper letters was admitted to the Eucharist of another Church. The importance of this service we learn alike from the letters of Ignatius and the *Teaching of the Apostles.*

"Be ye careful therefore to observe one Eucharist," writes Ignatius, "for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup unto union in His blood. . . . Assemble yourselves together in common . . . breaking one bread which is the medicine of immortality, and the antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ."

There is no record of the form of the service until the middle of the second century, but the account then given by Justin presents us with a structure which is the same as that of the Roman Mass of the present day, and equally of the English Communion Service. On the day of the Sun there is the meeting together of all who dwell in the cities and in the country. First are read the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets; then comes an address of admonition and consolation from the President; then follow prayers

" for ourselves . . . and for all others elsewhere, that we may be counted worthy to be found right livers and keepers of the commandment, that we may be saved with the eternal salvation." Then comes the kiss of peace. Bread and wine are offered, and the President offers up prayer and thanksgiving to the best of his power. Then they all partake of that for which thanks have been given. To them that are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. A collection is also made for widows and orphans, or those in prison and captivity, and for the entertainment of travellers. The words of the Eucharistic prayer were not fixed, but very early a tradition would grow up in each community. In the Epistle of Clement we have such a prayer preserved, and it presents a marked resemblance in diction to the later Liturgical formularies.

The service would be held in the large room of a private house. At one end would sit the Bishop facing the people, and on each side of him would be the presbyters; in front stood the altar (a name which it assumed in the second century), and beyond, facing the altar, would be the people. Men and women would be separated. How far at this time there was a distinction in the places assigned to catechumens and penitents, we cannot say.

But what were the beliefs behind this organization and worship? It would be easy, of course, to devote many volumes to the discussion of this point, and probably our conclusions would be indecisive. A clearer and more truthful view will be gained by conciseness. All our three main authorities agree in recognizing what, in the language of later theology, we may call the Trinitarian formula. That was clearly the common heritage of the Christian Churches. But while the second article impressed itself from the beginning on

the mind of the Church, the third was not yet prominent, and often ignored. The central point of early Christian teaching is Christ—Christ historical and Christ Divine. There are different stages of comprehension, there are different modes of expression, but to all alike His name sums up the Christian's hope. We have already remarked how the earliest form of false teaching to which we can ascribe a formal existence denied not the Divinity but the humanity of Christ. Equally striking is it that the direct ascription to Him of the term God is more common at an earlier than a later period. The term was liable to misinterpretation, and phrases which Ignatius pours forth with Oriental exuberance would have offended the careful language of a later time. There is no hesitation or doubt: Christ Divine, pre-existent, incarnate, the Redeemer, the Source of all spiritual life, is the central idea:

"There is one only physician, of flesh and of spirit, generate and ingenerate, God in man, true Life in death, Son of Mary and Son of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord."

So writes Ignatius, in language which a later age might have considered formally incorrect, but which no one who can see realities can mistake. Equally clear is the idea of the redemption through Christ. The present day will hardly quarrel with the Apostolic Fathers because they had no theory on the subject. We are beginning to recognize how dangerous theories on such subjects are. But the idea of redemption, of salvation, of atonement, is clear and decisive. We might illustrate it from any one of the Apostolic Fathers; the following quotation from Clement will suffice:

"Let us fix our eyes on the blood of Christ and understand how precious it is unto His Father, because,

being shed for our salvation, it won for the whole world the grace of repentance."

Equally remarkable is the strong sense of proportion. The early Church laid great stress on organization. Almost every document of this period touches on the question directly or indirectly. Yet the organization is always kept properly subordinate to the teaching for which it exists. Great stress is laid on Baptism and the Eucharist, yet these are always kept subordinate to the doctrines which give them a meaning. Doctrine is recognized as important, but it is always doctrine in harmony with life. Christian belief was always expected to lead up to and come forth in a high and pure life, a life of dignity and order, of devotion and love:

"Let him that hath love in Christ," says Clement, "fulfil the commandments of Christ. Who can declare the bond of the love of God? Who is sufficient to tell the majesty of its beauty? The height whereunto love exalteth is unspeakable. Love joineth us unto God; love covereth a multitude of sins. . . . In love were all the elect of God made perfect; without love nothing is well pleasing to God: in love the Master took us unto Himself; for the love which He had towards us Jesus Christ our Lord hath given His blood for us by the will of God, and His flesh for our flesh, and His life for our lives."

But this teaching is not anything new. The Christian writings of the beginning of the second century presuppose the writings of the Apostolic age. Behind the teaching, such as it is represented to us by Clement or Ignatius, there must have been a history and a theology such as is given to us by the writings contained in the Canon. Even if we had no certain evidence of the earlier existence of these writings, we should be com-

pelled to postulate such documents. The sub-Apostolic teaching implies the existence of the Apostolic. And when we come to examine our documents, we find that as a matter of fact they do contain quotations from or references to the literature which we possess and which claims to be Apostolic. The Apostolic Fathers occupy an intermediate position. In the Apostolic age the only Scriptures known are those inherited from the Jewish Church. By the end of the second century the New Testament books are on a level with the Old Testament. In the period between we can trace the growth of the New Testament Canon. Once we find S. Matthew's Gospel quoted as "Scripture"; but though generally the idea of a New Testament has hardly arisen, yet the New Testament books are used. We have clear quotations from almost all the Epistles of S. Paul, from that of S. James, and from the First of S. Peter. Both Papias and Polycarp quoted the First Epistle of S. John, and that implies the existence of his Gospel. Ignatius seems to quote the Gospel itself. There are probable but not certain references to the Acts of the Apostles. About the Synoptic Gospels it is difficult to be dogmatic. This much is clear, that the Apostolic Fathers made use of a Gospel or Gospels which contained a narrative and incidents indistinguishable from those in the Gospels we possess. The Apostolic Fathers prove the earlier existence of Apostolic teaching and Apostolic books.

It is not, of course, maintained that every statement which has been made in the foregoing account of the sub-Apostolic Church has been clearly proved. Popular exposition demands a certain amount of dogmatism, and makes it impossible to distinguish the exact shade of probability in the evidence for each separate statement. What is maintained as being proved is this.

Modern research has clearly shewn that we possess a body of writings dating from the close of the first or beginning of the second century. Their genuineness has been established, and they prove the existence at that date of a clearly defined and generally diffused Christianity, which may be viewed in relation either to its future developement or to its past history. With regard to the future, we find every element already existing which goes to make up the conception of the Catholic Church—as it is known to us at the end of the second century. Historians may devote their ability to tracing the modifications, the developement, the expansion of these ideas, but they must recognize that the "Catholic" conceptions of Christianity exist, in a somewhat inchoate form it may be, clearly and definitely as early as this. With regard to the past, we have not attempted to discuss the origin of any of the institutions we have described. That is another and a difficult problem. But it has been made clear that that problem is one which exists within certain narrow limits. The historian has no longer the 150 years which Baur indulged in. He is reduced to a period of not more than 70. All the books of the Canon, all the larger and more important ones at least, must have been written before the year 100. Before that date the Christianity of the Apostolic Fathers must have developed. The problem of the origin of Christianity has still to be faced, but it is reduced to smaller dimensions when we realize that Catholic Christianity, using the term in the sense which Baur affixed to it, had developed by the end of the first century.

INDEX

Abbot, G., Archbishop of Canterbury (1562–1633), 152 f.
Abraham, 4, 62, 297
Abyssinia, Church in, 147
Acilius Glabrio, M', 294
Acts of the Apostles, 16, 264, 265 f., 319
Adam, 4, 92–4
Agape, 302, 313
Aleppo, 151
Alexander, Natalis (1639–1724), 244
Alexander, M. S., Bishop in Jerusalem (1841–5), 159 f.
Alexandria, Patriarchate of, 148, 152, 153, 193, 219
America: Church in, 138, 154, 161; Puritans in, 77; Russian Church in, 166, 219
Andrew, S., in Asia, 305
Andrewes, L., Bishop of Winchester (1555–1626), 154, 243
Antioch, 297 ff., 308; Evodius Bishop of, 299; S. Peter at, 239, 251, 299; Patriarchate of, 148, 193, 219. See also *Ignatius, S.*
Apocalypse, 261; date and authorship, 265 f., 290 f.
Apologetic: ancient and modern, 1 ff., 22 f., 45, 70, 80; and Biblical Criticism, 3 ff., 60–1, 66, 106; basis of, for N.T., 15–21, 66–71; for O.T., 5–14, 17, 60–4; the historical problem, 65–71, 96 f., 318 ff.; the metaphysical problem, 29–36, 49 f., 82 ff., 87–89; unsound methods of, 13 f., 24 f., 33 f., 50, 64 f., 67 f., 70 f., 87–9, 92–4, 95 ff., 270. See also *Science*
Apologists, date of the, 266
Apostolic Fathers, 266, 319. See *Clement*, etc.
Aquinas, S. Thomas (*c.* 1225–74), 51 f., 135 f., 247 f.
Arianism, Arians, 113 n., 116 f., 133 f., 207, 252
Aristion, 307
Aristobulus, at Rome, 292
Aristotle, 233
Armenia, Church in, 147
L'Art de vérifier les Dates, 245
Articles, The XXXIX., 83, 136, 139, 151, 194, 281
Asia, 258, 290, 299 f., 305 f., 308, 311 f.; meaning of, 303 f.
Assemani, J. S. (1687–1768), 246
Assyrian Christians, Archbishop's Mission to, 165
Athanasian Creed, The (*Quicunque Vult*): its title, 133, 135, 139; assigned to Athanasius (296–373), 110, 116, 129 f., 132, 133 f., 135; to Caesarius of Arles (*c.* 468–542), 115 f., 123 f., 126, 127 ff., [133]; to Gaul, 111, 112, 113, 115; to Hilary of Arles (401–449), 111, 131; to Hilary of Poitiers († 368), 130; to Honoratus († 429), 115, 131; to School of Lerins, 115, 124, 128, 130 f., 132 f.; to Paulinus of Aquileia († 802), 112; to Spain (saec. iv.), 130; to Victricius of Rouen († *c.* 409), 112, 130; to Vigilius of Thapsus (saec. v.), 111; to Vincent of Lerins († *c.* 450), 111, 115, [124], 126, 131
Augustine of Hippo (354–430), relation to, 115, 124 ff., 130; Council of Autun (670) and, 132; Avitus of Vienne († 523) and, 124; Denebert of Worcester (798), Confession of, 118; Council of Florence (1441) and, 117, 135; Pope Gregory IX. (1227–41) and, 135; Alex. Hales († 1245) and, 135; Hincmar of Rheims (*c.* 852) and, 132; Orleans commentary, 121; Councils of Toledo (589–693), 122 f.; Trèves fragment, 118 f., 121 f.; Venantius Fortunatus (saec. vi.), commentary of, 121

Athanasian Creed, The (*cont.*)
and Apollinarianism, 116 f., 127; and Arianism, 116 f.; and the Double Procession, 112, 117, 135, 138, 140, 143; and Eutychianism, 126 f.; and Nestorianism, 124, 126 f.; and Priscillianism, 127, 130; and Sabellianism, 127, 134
Antelmi on, 111; Mr. Brewer on, 116; Dr. A. E. Burn on, 114 ff., 120, 122, 127, 131, 136 f.; Mr. A. C. Cooper-Marsdin on, 128; Bishop Dowden on, 145; Dr. Ffoulkes on, 112, 117; Prof. Harnack on, 113 f.; Mr. Harvey on, 112, 125, 130; Dr. Kattenbusch on, 115, 130; Dr. Künstle on, 120 f., 127, 130; Dr. Loofs on, 115, 119; Dr. Lumby on, 112, 118; Montfaucon on, 111; Dom Morin on, 115, 123, 127 ff.; Canon Newbolt on, 142 f.; Mr. Ommanney on, 114 ff., 137 f.; Plato, Archbishop of Moscow, on, 138; Pasch. Quesnel on, 111; Speroni on, 130; Dr. Swainson on, 112 ff., 118 f., 122 f., 124, 132 n.; Mr. C. H. Turner on, 116, 123, 128 ff., 130, 145; Archbishop Ussher on, 111; Vossius on, 110 f.; Bishop Waterland on, 111, 126 f., 131, 141; Bishop Westcott on, 112
its authority, 117, 132, 135 ff., 138 ff., 144; Thomas Aquinas and, 135 f.; the "warning" clauses, 113, 140–43; attitude of the American Church, 138; of the Eastern Church, 137 ff.; of the Church of England, 112, 117, 136, 139 f., 144 f.; of the Church of Ireland, 138; of the Roman Church, 136 f.
Athanasius, S., 79, 98, 103, 110 f., 116 f., 129 f., 132 ff., 215; and the *Fides Romanorum*, 134
Athos, Mt., 217
Atonement, Doctrine of the: and the Fall, 64, 92–3; Mr. R. J. Campbell on, 98–104; S. Clement of Rome and, 317 f.; Eastern Church and the, 187, 191
Augustine (of Hippo), S., 2, 79, 113, 124 ff., 128, 140, 215, 233, 234 f.; on the Trinity, 75 f., 115, 124 f., 129 ff.
Aurelius, M., Emperor (161–80), 285
Austrian Empire: Orthodox in, 148
Authority: meaning of, 65, 104 ff.; of the Church, 60, 66 n., 72 f., 75 f., 106 f., 108, 117, 163 f., 171 f., 181 ff.; of the Fathers, 45, 117, 213 f., 246; of Reason, 35, 66 n., 105, 107; of Scripture, 45, 66 n., 71 f., 105 f., 167 ff., 193, 196, 213 f., 246 (of N.T., 70 f.; of O.T., 61 f., 63, 65 f.); of Tradition, 66 n., 195, 213 f.

Balfour, Right Hon. A. J., 65 n.
Baptism: in the Early Church, 312, 315, 318; in the Eastern Church, 187; in the Russian Church, 197, 206; rebaptism, 207
Barnabas, S., 299; epistle of, 284 (and S. Matthew's Gospel, 319)
Baronius, Caesar, Cardinal (1538–1607), 238 f., 240, 244, 272, 280
Basil, S.: Liturgy of, 155, 224 f.
Basire, Isaac (1607–76), 153
Baur, F. C. (1792–1860), 249 f., 252, 262, 280 f., 320
Benedictine editions, 129, 245 f.
Berlin Academy editions, 255, 257
Bethlehem (and Jerusalem), Synod of (1672), 149 f., 152, 182, 200, 210, 227
Beveridge, W., Bishop of S. Asaph (1637–1708), *Synodicon*, 242
Bingham, J. (1668–1723), *Antiquities*, 242, 244
Birkbeck, Mr. W. J., 166, 178, 195, 207 ff., 228
Bishops. See *Episcopacy*
Bithynia, 287, 289 f.
Blackmore, Rev. R. W., 194–9, 203, 212 f., 226 ff.
Blass, Prof. F. (1843–1907), 264
Blomfield, C. J., Bishop of London (1786–1857), 158
Body, Rev. G., 211 n.
Bonn Conferences (1874–5), 162 ff., 170
Bossuet, J. B., Bishop of Meaux (1627–1704), 244
Bradley, Mr. F. H., 56
Bright, Dr. W. (1824–1901), 256 n.
Brightman, Rev. F. E., 225, 267
Buddhism, 276
Bulgaria, Church of, 148, 185
Bull, G., Bishop of St. Davids (1634–1710), 243
Bunsen, C. C. J. von (1791–1860), 272

Calvinism, 151, 152, 207, 220, 241
Campbell, Rev. R. J., 79–109

Canon : of the N.T., 73, 283, 318 ff. ; of the O.T., 6, 61
Canterbury, Archbishop of [R. T. Davidson], 3
Casaubon, I. (1559–1614), 151, 229n., 240 f., 242, 245, 246, 253, 264, 280
Catacombs, 258, 311 ; of S. Domitilla and S. Priscilla, 294
Causality, 24–6, 28, 32 f., 47 ff., 88 f., 247 f.
Cave, W. (1637–1713), 242
Cerinthus, 306
Chalcedon, Council of (451), 79, 147, 169
Cheyne, Dr. T. K., 4–5, 11
Christianity : basis and character of, 2 f., 16, 37, 64 f., 68 f., 74 f., 80, 88 f., 93 f., 98, 107 ff. ; origins of, Essays vii, viii ; Baur on, 249 f., 280 ff., Gibbon on, 247 f. ; pagan writers on, 287–90, 292, [293]
Chrysostom, S. John, 215 ; Sir H. Savile's edition, 242. See also *Liturgy*
Church, The : and criticism (early), 2, 9, 12 f., 59 ; (mediaeval), 2, 13, 53, 105 ; at Corinth, 17 f., 249, 281, 296 f. ; developement in, 72, 75, 312, 314 ; early discipline, 313 ; hospitality in, 313 ff., 316 ; in relation to Christianity, 37, 69 f., 107 ff. ; letters of commendation, 314 f. ; organization, 21, 302, 312 f., 315 f. See also *American ; Coptic ; Eastern ; England, Church of ; Gallican ; Roman ; Russian, etc.*
Church Missionary Society, 157 f., 160 f.
Church, R. W. (Dean) (1815–90), 21, 253
Claudius, Emperor (41–54), 292
Clemens, T. Flavius, 294
Clement of Alexandria, 60, 266, 306
Clement of Rome, S., 231, 295–8, 303, 310 ; Epistle to the Corinthians, 257, 263, 283, 290, 293, 296 ff., 316 ff. ; and the N.T., 296 f. ; spurious writings, 230
Colet, J. (Dean) (*c.* 1467–1519), 40, 151, 232 f., 241
Comparative Religion, 7, 12 f., 59, 101, 103
Conopius, Nathanael : at Oxford, 153
Constantine : *Donation* of, 232
Constantinople : 135, 151 ; Council of (381), 207 ; Patriarchate of, 138, 148, 152, 185, 193, 207 n., 219, 226
Coptic Church, 147, 157 f., 187
Corinth. See *Church, Clement of Rome, S. Paul*
Cotelier, J. († 1686), 244, 246
Cranmer, T., Archbishop of Canterbury (1489–1556), 151, 241
Creed : 312 ; Apostles', 44, 137 ; Nicene, 145, 274 ; Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan, 79, 106, 135, 137, 140, 142, 144 f., 149, 162, 169, 193, 226
Athanasian (*q.v.*) ; Fides Damasi, 122, 134 ; Fides Hieronymi, 134 ; Fides Romanorum, *ib.*
Criticism : disturbing effect of, 2 ff., 60, 67 f., 104, 235, 262, 278 ; Hegelianism and, 249, 282 ; proper function and method of, 70 f., 76, 168, 190, 223, 231, 234, 241, 255, 259–64, 269–77, 278 f., 281 f.
of the N.T., 15, 20 f., 64 f., 71, 74 f., 261 ff., 265 f., 305 f. ; of the O.T., 4 ff., 12, 60–4, 93, 106 ; in relation to Christology, 16, 64 f., 69, 94–8, 300 f., 305 f., 317
Cybele, 304
Cyprus, 148, 165
Cyril of Jerusalem, S., 1 f., 203
Cyril Lucar (*c.* 1572–1638), 152 f.

D'Achery, J. L. (1609–85), 245
Daillé, J. (1594–1670), 243, 273
Damasus, Pope († 384), 122, 134
Darwin, Charles, 80. See also *Evolution*
Deacons, Function of, 312 f. ; deaconesses, 313
Decretals, False, 231 ; suspected by Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa, 232 ; *Donation* of Constantine, 232
Deism, 24, 51 n.
Denebert of Worcester, 118
De Rossi, G. B. († 1894), 258, 294
Design, Argument from, 24, 26, 28
Dictionary : of Christian Antiquities, 267 ; *of Christian Biography*, *ib.*
Dio Cassius, 293
Dionysius the Areopagite, 232 f., 280
Docetism, Judaistic, 300, 305 f., 317
Döllinger, J. J. I. von (1799–1891), 162 f., 248
Dogma : 1, 71 ; meaning of, 42 ff., 142 f. ; involved in the Lord's Prayer, 44, 86 ; necessity of, 45, 77, 142
Domitian, Emperor (81–96), 265 f., 293 f.
Domitilla, Flavia, 294

Dorpius, Martin (1460–1526), 235
Double Procession. See *Filioque*
Driver, Dr. S. R., 5
Duchesne, Mgr. L., 254, 256 n., 267, 272, 295
Du Perron, J. D., Cardinal (1556–1618), 242
Du Pin, L. E. (1657–1719), 244, 246, 272
Durand, P. T. (1729–1810), 245

Easter (Paschal) Controversy, 309
Eastern Church, The: its extent, 147 f.; its constituent Churches, 148 f., 185, 192 ff., 219; heretical and separated bodies, 147, 165, 184; in relation to National Churches, 185 f., 217 f. See also *Georgia, Church in*; *Greek Church*; *Russian Church*, etc.
its theological position, 39 f., 117, 149, 162–4, 167, 169 f., 171 ff., 187 f., 191, 193 ff., 215 f.; on the Atonement, 187, 191; Baptism, 187; Icons, 174–7; invocation of Saints, 177 ff.; Purgatory, 154; Sacraments, doctrine of, 187, 196 ff., 203 f.; Sacraments, seven in number, 149, 162 f., 170 ff., 187, 193; Scripture, authority of, 193; Tradition, authority of, 195; Transubstantiation, doctrine of, 171 f., 199 f.; Virgin, position of the, 176, 178 f.; works of supererogation, 210 f. See also *Athanasian Creed*, *Filioque*
recognizes seven General Councils, 149, 162 f., 173, 193, 226; *Catechism* of Kyriakos, 150; *Longer Catechism* of Philaret, *ib.*, 167 f., 193; decrees of Synod of Bethlehem, 149 f., 152, 182; Liturgical books, 137 f., 150 f., 154 f., 156, 187, 203 f., 226; *Orthodox Confession* of Peter Mogila, 149 f., 182, 226 f.; the *Te Deum*, 139
in relation to American Church, 161 f.; to Church of England, 150, 152–62, 164 ff. (Anglican Orders, 166, 220), 167–73, 183 ff., 194; to Old Catholics, 162 f.; to Roman Church, 150 f., 152, 153 f., 161, 165 f., 169, 172, 181 ff., 193 f.
Eastern Church Association, 161, 195, 228
Ebionism, 249, 281
Egypt, 147, 157 f., 165
Encyclopaedia Britannica, The (Prof. R. Wallace in), 252, 271 f.
England, Church of: position of, 38 f., 146 ff., 150 ff., 183 ff., 187 f., 190 f., 241 f.; recognizes six General Councils, 173; as a National Church, 185 f., 223; in relation to the Athanasian Creed (*q.v.*); to authority, 66 n., 106 f., 139, 167 ff., 173 f.; to the Eastern Church (*q.v.*); Prayers for the Dead, 209 f.; Priesthood, 188, 206 (Anglican Orders, 166, 206, 220, 221, 256 n.); to Russian Church (*q.v.*); to Sacramental teaching, 171 ff., 206; to Scripture, 106 f., 167 ff.; to Tradition, 38, 66 n., 72 f., 106 f., 167 ff. See also *Articles*, *Nonjurors*, *Prayer Book*
Ephesus: S. John at, 276, 286, 304–306; S. Paul at, 304 (Epistle, 265, 304); S. Ignatius' letter to, 299; Council of (431), 147, 216
Episcopacy, 306, 312; S. Ignatius on, 301 f., 307
Erasmus, D. (*c.* 1466–1536), 40, 151, 239 f., 241, 245, 246, 253, 255, 264; and Biblical Criticism, 105, 233–6
Ethelhard, Archbishop of Canterbury († 805), 118
Eucharist, The: in the early Church, 313, 315 f., 318; S. Cyril of Jerusalem on, 203; S. Ignatius on, 302, 315; S. Justin Martyr on, 315 f.; S. John of Damascus on, 198 f.; Philaret of Moscow on, 199 f.; Prayer of Consecration, 154, 187, 203 f.; Zwinglian view, 186; Transubstantiation, Eastern and Roman views of, 171 f., 198 ff., 201 f., 205 f. See also *Liturgy*
Eusebius of Caesarea, 307
Evil: 300; Mr. R. J. Campbell on, 89 ff., 97
Evolution, 21, 24 f., 26 f., 28, 30, 42, 48, 80, 93–4

Fabricius, J. A. (1668–1736), 257, 268
Fairbairn, Dr. A. M., 263
Fall, Doctrine of the, 92–4
Ficino, M. (1433–99), 232
Filioque Clause, The, 112, 117, 137 f., 140, 143, 169, 216; Latin monks of Mt. Olivet and, 135; Bonn Conference and, 163 f., 169 f.

First-Gate People [Ἡ γειτονία τῶν πρωτοπλειτῶν], 311 f.
Flacius, Matthias (1520–75), 237. See *Magdeburg Centuriators*
Fleury, C. (1640–1723), 239, 244
Florence, Council of (1441), 117, 135, 173
Forsyth, Dr. P. T., 104 ff., 107
Frankfort, Council of (794), 173

Gallican Church, 111, 112, 113, 115, 131 f., 241, 308
Gardner, Dr. Percy, 67–9
Genesis, Book of, 4, 22 f., 27, 93
Georgia, Church of, 186, 219
Gibbon, E. (1737–94), 247
Gieseler, J. K. L. (1792–1854), 238, 247
Gnosticism, 83, 97, 249, 285
Gobat, S., Bishop in Jerusalem († 1879), 157 f., 160
God: ancient conceptions of, 7, 85; Jewish, 6 ff., 61, 63, 85, 101; Christian, 44, 75 f., 84 ff., 93, 100–4; Marcion's, 12 and Law, 25, 27 f., 49; arguments for existence of, valid and invalid, 24 ff., 33, 35 f., 49 f.; immanence of, 82 ff., 96 f.; self-limitation of, 84 f. See also *Theism*
Golden Legend, The, 53
Gospels: 16, 19 f., 68 ff., 74, 92, 263; the Synoptic, 66, 265 f., 319; S. Matthew, [74], 319; S. Mark, 307; S. Luke, 16, [74], 265 f.; the Fourth, 305 f., 319
Greek Church, The, 137 f., 148, 150, 153 f., 170, 180, 185, 217, 224; English travellers and, 153. See also *Eastern Church*
Green, Prof. T. H. (1836–82), 56
Gregory Dialogos, S., Liturgy of, 225
Grocyn, W. (*c.* 1446–1519), 233
Grotius, H. (1583–1645), 242, 243, 246

Hadrian, Emperor (117–137), 285 f.
Hallam, H. (1777–1859), 244
Hammond, H. (1605–60), 242 f.
Hardouin, J. (1646–1727), 227, 245
Harnack, A.: 66, 254 f., 256, 265, 274; *Chronologie*, 15, 255, 263; *Dogmengeschichte*, 74 f., 86, 113 f., 230, 268; on the Ignatian letters, 263, 284
Hatch, Dr. E. (1835–89), 274
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 99, 101, 265 f., 297
Hefele, C. J. von, Bishop of Rottenburg (1809–93), 272
Hegel, Hegelianism, 249, 282
Henotheism, 6, 61
Hermas: 313 f.; *Shepherd* of, 284, 290, 314
Hierapolis, 304, 305, 307
Hildner, Rev. F. A. († 1883), 157
Hippolytus, S., 257, 266, 272
Homer: 5; theology of, 7
Hooker, R. (*c.* 1554–1600), 243
Horologium: of the Greek Church, 137 f.; of the Russian Church, 224 f.
Hort, Dr. F. J. A. (1828–92), 254, 276
Howley, W., Archbishop of Canterbury (1766–1848), 159
Hume, D. (1711–76), 247

Icons, 174–7, 211 f., 217
Idealism, 54, 56, 89
Ignatius, S.: Life, 298 ff., 307, 308, 310, 314; Letters, 272 f., 284, 290, 299 ff., 306, 308, 312, 315, 317 ff.; Bishop Grosseteste and, 242; Long Recension, 242 f.; Milton on, 243; Pearson's *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, 242 f., 259 ff.; Curetonian Syriac, 243; controversy as to, 243, 262, 263, 284; attributed to a Cynic (by D. Völter), 273; Von der Goltz on, 263; spurious correspondence with the Virgin, 242; Bishop Lightfoot's edition, 15, 243, 260, 262 f., 264 on Episcopacy, 301 f., 307, 312; on the Eucharist, 315; on the Person of Christ, 259 f., 317; on the Virgin Birth, 74
Immanence: Divine, 82 ff., 96 f.
Infinity, 82–5
Invocation of Saints, 177 ff., 210 f.
Irenaeus, S., 84, 266, 306, 308 f., 310
Isaiah, 4, 9, 17

Jacobite Church in N. Syria, 147
James, S.: Epistle of, 16, 266, 296 f., 319; Liturgy of, 155
Jassy, Synod of (1643), 226
Jerome, S., 233 f.; *Fides Hieronymi*, 134
Jerusalem: Anglican bishopric in, 158 ff., 165; Patriarchate of, 148, 165, 193, 219, 226; Synod of (1672), see *Bethlehem*

Jesuits: 137, 154, 244; Bollandists, 245; edition of Byzantine historians, *ib.*; Labbé's *Concilia*, 245; Cyril Lucar and, 152; Master Fisher, 154; D. Petavius (1583–1652), 243
Jews, Judaism: 12, 59, 268, 276, 291; and the O.T., 4 ff.; conception of God, 6 ff., 61, 63, 101; Messianic expectation, 9 f., 14, 17, 62 f.; mission of Israel, 9, 14, 62, 314. See also *Docetism*, *Law*
Johannine Writings, The, 16, 66, 263, 265 f., 290 f., 297, 305 f., 319
John, S., 276, 286, 304 ff., 307 f., 310
John of Damascus, S., 163 f., 198 f., 226
John the Presbyter, 307
Jude, S.: Epistle of, 16, 266
Jülicher, A., 250
Justin Martyr, S., 2, 60, 315
Juvenal, 298

Kant, I. (1724–1804), 31 ff.
Keble, Rev. J. (1792–1866): Assize Sermon on "National Apostasy" (1833), 249
Khomiakoff, A. S. (1804–60), 178 f., 181, 186, 195, 201 f., 204, 208 f., 211 n., 214, 220 f., 223, 228
King, Rev. J. G. (1732–87), 156, 172, 225, 227
Kraus, F. X. († 1901), 267
Kurtz, J. H., 238

Labbé, P. (1607–67), 245
Lagarde, P. de (1827–91), 257
Lambeth Conference (1867), 162 n.; (1888), 173
Laodicea, 304
Laud, W., Archbishop of Canterbury (1573–1645), 154
Law: Deistic conception of, 24; scientific and religious conceptions of, 25, 29, 47 f., 50 f., 55 f.
Law: the Jewish, 8, 12 f., 14, 299
Le Clerc, J. (1657–1736), 243, 246
Lessing, G. E. (1729–81), 66, 247
Levant Company, The, 151
Liddon, Dr. H. P. (1829–90), 163 n., 244
Lieder, Mr., of Basle, 157 f.
Lightfoot, J. B., Bp. of Durham (1828–89): 114, 254, 267, 279, 282, 288, 304; edition of S. Clement, 257, 293, 295; of S. Ignatius (*q.v.*)
Linacre, T. (1460–1524), 40
Lipsius, R., 295
Liturgy: early forms, 209, 296, 313, 315 f.; of S. Basil, 155, 224 f.; of S. Chrysostom, 150 f., 154 f., 203 f., 224 f.; Coptic, 187; of S. Gregory Dialogos, 224 f.; of S. James, 155
Lodge, Sir O. J., 51 n.
Longley, C. T., Archbishop of Canterbury (1794–1868), 162
Luke, S., 16, 265
Luther, M. (1483–1546): 2, 74, 186, 233; and Erasmus, 235 ff.; on the Atonement, 98 f.
Lutheran Church, The, 159 f., 207, 220, 226, 237
Lux Mundi, 15

Mabillon, J. (1632–1707), 245
Macdonald, Dr. Greville, 52
Magdeburg Centuriators, The, 237 f., 240, 280
Mai, A., Cardinal (1782–1854), 246
Mansi, J. D. (1692–1769), 245
Marcion, 12
Mark, S., 292, 307
Martene, E. (1654–1739), 245
Materialism: 53, 55, 85, 108; metaphysical criticism of, 30, 33, 35, 57
Maurice, F. D. (1805–72), 103
Messiah: expectation of, 9 f., 14, 17, 62 f.
Metaphysics: and science, 30, 46 f., 54; Kantian, 31 ff.; true and false, 22, 28 ff., 35 f., 49, 55, 64, 67, 82 ff., 85
Metrophanes Critopoulos, 152 f.
Miletus, 304, 306
Milman, H. H. (Dean) (1791–1868), 248
Milton, J. (1608–74), 27, 243
Mind: 32, 34, 49, 56 f.; and matter, 28, 30, 33, 55; limitations of human, 31, 58, 85
Modernism, 2, 256 n.
Möhler, J. A. (1796–1838), 248
Mogila, Peter, Metropolitan of Kieff (*c.* 1600–47), 149, 226 f.
Mommsen, Th. (1817–1903), 264, 268, 288
Monism, 87, 89
Monolatry, 6
Monophysitism, 147
Monotheism: in O.T., 6, 13, 61, 64, 101
Montanism, 304
Montenegro, Church in, 148, 185
Montfaucon, B. de (1655–1741), 111, 245

More, Sir T. (1478–1535), 151, 241
Moses, 4
Mosheim, J. L. (1694–1755), 238, 247
Mysticism, 97, 99

Narcissus, 292
Neale, Rev. J. M. (1818–66), 149 n., 161, 201, 225 f., 227 f.
Neander, A. (1789–1850), 238, 247, 267
Neotheroi (Νεόθηροι), 312
Nero, Emperor (54–68), 288, 293, 295
Nestorianism, 124, 126 f., 147, [165]
Newman, Cardinal (1801–90), 252 f.
New Testament, The: 21, 60, 64, 71, 99; and O.T. morality, 8; and interpretation of O.T., 4, 8, 9 f., 12 f., 234; and science, 23; dates of N.T. books, 15 f., 20, 66, 250, 261 f., 265 f., 320 (see also *Canon*); doctrine of the Atonement, 99 ff.; Revised Version of, 235; Westcott and Hort's edition of, 254
New Theology, The. See Essay iii *passim*
Nicaea: First Council of (325), 283 [see also *Creed*]; Second Council of (787), 173 ff.
Nicetius, Archbishop of Trèves, 122
Nonjurors, The, 155 f., 180

Old Catholics, 162 f.
Old Testament: 2, 5, 60, 64, 245; and Doctrine of the Fall, 92–3; Morality of, 8, 14, 61; New Testament use of, 4, 8, 9 f., 12 f., 101, 234; method of teaching, 4, 13 f. See also *Apologetic, Canon, Criticism, Prophets*
Orders, Anglican. See *England, Church of*
Origen, 2, 234, 266; *Hexapla*, 245
Owen, Sir R. (1804–92), 21
Oxford: Colet at, 40, 232 f.; Erasmus and Linacre at, 40; Greek students at, 152 f., 154; Tractarianism at, 252 f.

Palmer, Rev. W., of Magdalen (1811–79), 149 n., 161, 195
Pantheism: in ancient literature, 7; Mr. R. J. Campbell and, 87–91, 97
Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, 307, 319
Pastoral Epistles, 16, 265, 304, 306
Pattison, Mark (1813–84), 229, 241 f., 253, 278
Paul, S.: 72, 99, 291, 296 f., 299; and the Fall, 92–3; Christology of, 16, 18, 281; Epistles, 16 ff., 66, 69 f., 263, 265 f., 319 (Colossians, 304, 306; Corinthians, 17 f.; Ephesians, 265, 304; Philemon, 304; Philippians, 262; Timothy, 304. See also *Pastoral Epp., Romans*)
Pearson, J., Bishop of Chester (1612–86), 280; *Critici Sacri*, 246; *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, 242 f., 259 ff.
Pergamum, 304
Persecution of Christians, 287 ff., 290 f., 293 ff.
Personality, 56 f., 84 ff., 89, 96 f.
Peter, S., 237, 239, 251, 272, 292, 299 (see also *Antioch, Rome*); 1 Peter, 265 f., 290, 297, 319; 2 Peter, 16, 266, 276
Philadelphia, 299
Philaret, Archbishop of Moscow († 1867), 150, 193, 199 f., 208, 210 f., 227
Philip, S., 305
Philip Neri, S. (1515–95), 238
Philippi, 300; S. Paul's Ep. to, 262; S. Ignatius and, 308; S. Polycarp and, 284, 308
Philo, 268
Phrygia, [258], 304, [311 f.]
Pitra, J. B., Cardinal (1812–89), 246
Plato, Platonism, 7, 31, 34, 90, 91, 232 f., 280
Plato, Archbishop of Moscow (1775), 138
Pliny the Younger, 286 ff., 289 f.
Polycarp, S., 263, 284, 299, 306, 307–10, 319; epistle of, 284, 308; *Martyrdom* of, 290
Porphyrabaphoi (Πορφυραβάφοι), 312
Pragmatism, 33 f.
Prayer Book: American, 138, 154; English, 39, 117, 136, 150 f., 169, 315; Irish, 138; Scottish, 154
Presbyters, 312. See *Church (organization)*
Priscilla, S.: Catacombs of, 294
Priscillianism, 127, 130
Prophets (O.T.): teaching of, 7 f., 14, 64, 101
Protestantism: and Scripture, 21, 45, 71, 73, 105, 246; Prof. Khomiakoff on, 186; standpoint of, 39, 80, 109, 146, 151, 158 f., 165, 169, 183 ff., 188, 194, 207, 219 f., 226, 235 ff., 239, 246, 252, 270 ff., 280
Psalms, 64

Psychology: as basis for Apologetic, 67, 80; experimental, 29, 54 f.
Ptolemaeus of Lucca, 231
Purgatory, 154, 179, 207 ff., 210

Ramsay, Sir W. M., 258, 264, 288, 311
Rashdall, Dr. H., 56
Rationalism, 11, 22, 247, 252 f., 254, 264, 271
Realism, 54, 56 f.
Rebaptism: Eastern Church and, 207
Reformation, The: 2, 71, 73, 80, 92–3, 103, 110, 135 f., 168, 180, 215, 280; in England, 38 ff., 136, 150 f.; Counter-Reformation, the, 180, 280
Renaissance, The, 230, 232. See *Colet, Erasmus, etc.*
Renan, E. (1823–92): 239, 241, 244, 247, 251f., 269, 309; on Criticism, 251, 271
Renaudot, E. (1646–1720), 246
Resurrection, The: 69, 95, 191; Marcan account, 307
Reunion, 148, 150, 155 f., 167, 180–3, 190 f., 221–4. See also *Bonn Conferences*
Revelation: 59 f.; in the Prophets, 7 f.; in O.T. generally, 13, 64; rationality of, 36; the Christian, 60, 64 f., 70, 74 ff., 84 f., 101–3, 106, 167, 274
Revelation, Book of. See *Apocalypse*
Réville, J., 263, [273]
Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, 273
Righteousness: 93–4; in O.T., 7 ff., 13, 61, 64, 85; in N.T., 13, 93
Ritschl, A. (1822–89), 64
Robert Elsmere, 15
Roman Empire: 18 f., 268, 276, 284 ff., 297; and the Christians, 287 ff., 290–3, 297, 311 f.
Romans: S. Paul's Epistle to, 73, 92–3, 232 f., 291 f.; S. Ignatius' Epistle to, 300, 302 f.
Rome, Church of: S. Peter at, 231, 237, 239, 272, 292; S. Paul at, 292; origin of, 291 ff.; catacombs at, 294, 311; S. Clement at, 295 ff.; *Fides Romanorum*, 134; list of bishops, 295; Polycarp and, 309 f.; legendary history (Ptolemaeus of Lucca), 231; Magdeburg Centuriators and, 237 f.; .Baronius and, 238 f.; pseudo-Decretals, 231 f. See also *Romans, Ep. to*
standpoint of, 21, 37, 39, 107, 136 f., 146, 161, 169, 184 f., 188, 190, 205, 209, 237 f., 256 n., 276; Oath of Pius IV., 194. See also *Eastern Church; England, Church of; Russian Church*
Roumania, Church of, 148, 219
Rousseau, J. J. (1712–78), 247
Russian Church, extent of, 218; a National Church, 148 f., 185 f., 217 f.; part of the Eastern Church, 147 f., 180; position of the Holy Synod, 192 f., 200 n., 227; of the laity, 217 f.; of the Tzar, 218
its theological position, Essay vi *passim*, esp. 193–216 (and see *Eastern Church*); on Baptism, 197, 206 f.; Chrism, 197, 212; on Communion of Saints, 211; on the Faith, 196; Faith and knowledge, 212; Faith and works, 212 f., 216; hymns, 224; Icons, 177, 211 f., 217; Immaculate Conception denied, 179; invocation of Saints, 177 f., 210 f.; Pilgrimages, 217, 219; Prayers for the Dead, 203, 207 ff. (including the Saints, 210 f.); Purgatory, 179, 207 ff., 210; Sacraments, doctrine of, 196 ff.; Scripture, authority of, 167, 193, 196, 213 f., 216; Tradition, 167, 213 f., 216; Transubstantiation, doctrine of, 171 f., 198–201, 205 (*cf.* 202 ff.)
recognizes seven General Councils, 193; *Longer Catechism*, 150, 167 f., 193, 197 ff., 200 n., 212 f., 227; decrees of Synod of Bethlehem, 149 n., 200 f., 210; Liturgical books, 224–6; *Treatise on the Duty of Parish Priests*, 193 f., 195–7, 202 f., 205 ff., 213 f., 227; *Orthodox Confession* of Peter Mogila, 226 f.
in relation to America, 161, 166, 219; to Church of England, 72, 155, 156, 165 f., 186, 220; to Protestants, 186, 207, 216, 219, 226; to Church of Rome, 166, 172, 177, 186, 199–202, 205 ff., 210, 216, 219 ff., 222 f.

Sabatier, P. (1682–1742), 245
Sabinus, T. Flavius, 294 f.
Sacerdotalism, 187 f., 206 f.
Sacraments: 21, 167, 172, 186,

205 f. ; seven, 149, 162 f., 170 ff., 187, 196 f., 206
Sacrifice, 13, 63 f., 101 ff., 202 ff.
Sardis, 304
Sayce, Prof. A. H., 4–5
Scaliger, J. J. (1540–1609), 245, 246
Schaff, P., 238
Scholasticism, Schoolmen, 2, 43, 51 f., 80, 106, 180, 186, 201 f., 215, 232, 235, 278
Schürer, E., 268
Science : and Morality, 22 ; and the N.T., 23 ; and the O.T., 4, 22 f. ; and Religion, 21 f., 24 ff., 33 ff., 43 f., 46 ff., 50, 51–4, 57 ; limitations of, 22, 28–31, 46, 48 ff., 52 f., 65, 273. See also *Law*
Scotland : Presbyterianism in, 77, 218, 221 ; *Shorter Catechism*, 281 ; Scottish Liturgy (1637), 154
Seebohm, F., 229 n., 234
Selden, J. (1584–1654), 280
Seleucidae, 298
Servia, Church in, 148, 185
Silas, 292
Sin, 64, 89–94, 99–104
Smyrna, 151, 299, 304, 306–9
Stillingfleet, E., Bishop of Worcester (1635–99), 154
Strong, T. B. (Dean of Christ Church), 84 f.
Supernatural, The : in religion, 5, 16, 19 f., 58, 64, 69, 270 f., 273, 279

Tacitus, 287 f., 291, 292
Teaching of the XII. Apostles, 284, 315
Tertullian, 2, 266
Theism : early approaches to, 7, 61 ; arguments for, 24 f., 36, 49 ; Kant's argument, 31 ff. ; in relation to science, 25, 27 f., 49 f., 52 f., 58
Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury (602–90), 173
Theology : of the ancient world, 7 f. ; of the Jews, 6 ff., 61 ff. ; developement in, 74 ff., 79 ; terms of restatement, 1 f., 93 ; Dogmatic, Essay ii *passim* (its subject-matter, 44) ; Natural, 46–58 ; New Theology, 79–104 ; Ritschlian, 64 f.
Tillemont, S. (1637–98), 244, 272
Timothy, S., 292, 304
Titus, Emperor (79–81), 289
Toledo, Councils of, 122 f. ; and the *Filioque*, 169
Trajan, Emperor (97–117), 284, 286 ff., 306
Tralles, 299, 304
Trent, Council of (1545–52), 154, 215, 281
Trinity, Doctrine of the, 75 f., 84, 95 f., 124 f., 129, 164, 196, 316 f.
Troas, 299, 308
Tübingen School, The. See *Baur*
Turkey, 148, 152, 185, 189

Unction, Sacrament of, 171, 197, 212
Unsectarianism : danger of, 77
Ussher, J., Archbishop of Armagh (1581–1656), 111, 242 f., 280

Valentinus, Valentinianism, 97, 259 f.
Valla, Laurentius (1406–57), 232 f.
Vatican Council (1870), 162
Vaughan, H. E., Cardinal, 205, 222
Venn, Rev. H. (1796–1873), 158
Vespasian, Emperor (69–79), 294
Vigilius of Thapsus, 111, 129
Virgin, The Blessed : second Council of Nicaea and, 174 ; attitude of Eastern Church, 176, 178, 199, 210 ; pseudo-Ignatian correspondence, 242
Virgin Birth, The, 74, 95, 199
Vitalis, Ordericus (1075–1150), 230
Voltaire (1694–1778), 247
Vossius, I. (1618–89), 110, 243, 280
Vulgate, The, 106, 233 f.

Wake, W., Archbishop of Canterbury (1657–1737), 155 f., 244
Walker, Mr. W. L., 102, 106
Walton, B., Bishop of Chester (1600–81), 242
Ward, W. G. (1812–82), 252
Waterloo, Battle of : its historical character, 67 ff.
Weizsäcker, C. von, 250 f.
Wellhausen, J., 5
Westcott, B. F., Bishop of Durham (1825–1901), 112, [254]
Westminster, Dean of (J. Armitage Robinson), 94
Williams, Rev. G. (1814–78), 156, 159 f., 161 f.
Wisdom Literature, The, 64

Young, J. F., Bishop of Florida (1820–85), 199 f.

Zahn, Prof. Th., 15
Zwingli, H. (1484–1531), 186

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD.,
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.

MURRAY'S NEW ILLUSTRATED BIBLE DICTIONARY.

A New Bible Dictionary written by Leading Scholars of to-day, and including the Results of Modern Research. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM C. PIERCY, Chaplain at the Whitelands Training College, Chelsea. With Illustrations, Plans and Coloured Maps. Medium 8vo. **21*s.*** net.

"This worthy volume is a compilation of most interesting and informing material. It is one that any person with serious claims to be called a reader might take up at odd moments and find therein an endless source of pleasure and profit. To the student of theology and Biblical lore it is a desideratum revealed, and no candidate for, or qualified member of, the Christian ministry should pursue his course a day longer without it. . . . So it is a good book, because you can take its word for granted; because you can tuck it under your arm if you are going out to some debate or lecture; because you can get solid food and even diversion for the mind by its pages—and good books, of such a kind, are not too plentiful."—*Daily Chronicle.*

SIR WILLIAM SMITH'S SMALLER DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. With Maps and Illustrations. Cheap Edition. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

A CHEAPER EDITION OF

THE LATE CANON MOBERLY'S WORKS.

Demy 8vo. 6*s.* net each.

PROBLEMS AND PRINCIPLES. Being Papers on Subjects Theological and Ecclesiastical.

CHRIST OUR LIFE. Sermons chiefly preached at Oxford.

ATONEMENT AND PERSONALITY.

MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. From its Foundation to the End of the Third Century. By MONSIGNOR LOUIS DUCHESNE. Demy 8vo. 9*s.* net.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN. The Greek Text Revised, with a Revised English Version and Notes. By the late B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. 2 Vols. Demy 8vo. 24*s.* net.

THE SECOND TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM, Its History and Structure. By the Rev. W. SHAW CALDECOTT, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society; Author of "The Tabernacle," etc. With Plans and Illustrations. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

CONTENTIO VERITATIS. Essays in Constructive Theology. By SIX OXFORD TUTORS. A Revised and Cheap Edition. Demy 8vo. 5*s.* net.

CONTENTS:

I. THE ULTIMATE BASIS OF THEISM, by the Rev. H. RASHDALL, D.Litt., D.C.L.
II. THE PERSON OF CHRIST, by the Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D.
III. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST, by the Rev. H. L. WILD, M.A.
IV. THE PERMANENT RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, by the Rev. C. F. BURNEY, M.A.
V. MODERN CRITICISM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, by the Rev. W. C. ALLEN.
VI. THE CHURCH, by the Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, M.A.
VII. THE SACRAMENTS, by the Rev. Professor W. R. INGE, D.D.

Works by the Rt. Rev. CHARLES GORE, D.D., Bishop of Birmingham

THE INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD. BAMPTON LECTURES, 1891. *Cheap Edition.* Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

WHY WE CHRISTIANS BELIEVE IN CHRIST. The BAMPTON LECTURES. Shortened for Popular Use by the Rev. T. C. FRY. Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.* net.

THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH. Four Lectures delivered in the Cathedral Church of St. Asaph. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

DISSERTATIONS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE INCARNATION. *Cheap Edition.* Large Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE BODY OF CHRIST. An Enquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of the Holy Communion. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE NEW THEOLOGY AND THE OLD RELIGION. Being Eight Lectures, together with Five Sermons. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* net.

A Series of Practical Exposition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net each.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. Also in Paper Covers. 6*d.* net.

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. A Practical Exposition.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. A Practical Exposition. 2 Vols.

EDITED BY THE RT. REV. CHARLES GORE, D.D.

LUX MUNDI. A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. By VARIOUS WRITERS. *Cheap Edition.* Large Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

ESSAYS ON CHURCH REFORM. By NUMEROUS WRITERS. Crown 8vo. *Cheap Edition.* 5*s.* net.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

A 000 021 091 4